

JR BOOKS ONLINE BANNED BOOK SERIES + BOOK 14

THE TALMUDIC JEW

EXPANDED EDITION



AUGUST ROHLING

TRANSLATED & EDITED BY JR BOOKS ONLINE

AUGUST ROHLING

THE TALMUDIC JEW

Expanded Edition

JRBooksOnline, 2024

THE TALMUDIC JEW

By August Rohling

Originally published in French as:
Auguste Rohling, *Le Juif selon le Talmud*,
Paris: Albert Savine, 1889.

Translation from French © 2024 by JRBooksOnline.com.
Copyright © 2024 by JRBooksOnline.com. All rights reserved.

No part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording, or otherwise, except as provided by U.S. copyright law, without the prior written permission of JRBooksOnline.com.

E-mail: info@jrbooksonline.com

Order additional copies from:
The Barnes Review history magazine
P.O. Box 550
White Plains, MD 20695
www.BarnesReview.com
1-877-773-9077 toll free

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword to the 2024 English Edition	5
Preface by Édouard Drumont	7
Introduction	13

PART ONE

OVERVIEW OF THE TALMUD

1. Talmudism.....	23
2. Development of the Talmud.....	28
3. A Sacred Book for Jews.....	30

PART TWO

CORRUPTION OF DOCTRINES

1. The God of the Talmud.....	34
2. Angels	37
3. Demons	39
4. Mysteries.....	43
5. Jewish and Christian Souls.....	45
6. Heaven and Hell	47
7. The Messiah and His Reign.....	48

PART THREE

CORRUPTION OF MORALS

1. Neighbor.....	50
2. Property and World Supremacy	55
3. Fraud	58
4. Found Objects.....	60
5. Usury.....	62
6. Murder.....	66
7. Woman.....	71
8. Oath.....	76
9. Christians	81
10. Excommunication.....	87

PART FOUR
OUR CENTURY

1. The Modern Jew.....	90
2. Opinions of Our Contemporaries	107
Conclusion	112

FOREWORD TO THE 2024 ENGLISH EDITION

August Rohling (1839–1931) was a German Catholic theologian, professor and author of critical studies of the Talmud, Judaism and Protestantism. His most famous work is *Der Talmudjude* (*The Talmudic Jew*), first published in 1871 in Münster. Immediately after its appearance, the Jews unleashed a smearing campaign against the book and its author, even though all Rohling did was quote from the Talmud and various Jewish scholars.

We are happy to present the first English-language edition of this valuable historical document. We have made our translation from the French edition published in 1889 under the title *Le Juif selon le Talmud* (literally: *The Jew According to the Talmud*). Its translator and editor was A. Pontigny, who also wrote an introduction and a conclusion. Édouard Drumont contributed a preface.

The original German edition was greatly expanded by Pontigny, mostly from Rohling's other publications. At the same time, some less significant text (mainly in Part Four) was purposefully left out.

This book will be of great use to anyone interested in the history of Judaism.

Technicalities

We have made minor corrections, adjustments and additions based on the German original, as well as on another French translation, done by Abbé Maximilien de Lamarque (*Le Juif Talmudiste*, 1888).

In Part Four, Pontigny used original French sources whenever possible, instead of translating from German. Further text has been edited by us after consulting other French or German sources.

The notes have been placed at the end of each chapter (discrepancies between different editions are reflected in square brackets). Our notes are marked accordingly.

JRBooksOnline.com
January 2024

AUGUSTE ROHLING

LE JUIF

SELON LE TALMUD

ÉDITION FRANÇAISE CONSIDÉRABLEMENT AUGMENTÉE

PAR A. PONTIGNY

Préface d'ÉDOUARD DRUMONT



PARIS

NOUVELLE LIBRAIRIE PARISIENNE

ALBERT SAVINE, ÉDITEUR

12, Rue des Pyramides, 12

—
1889

Tous droits réservés.

Front page of the 1889 French edition.

PREFACE BY ÉDOUARD DRUMONT

My dear colleague,

You've had an excellent idea to publish a new French translation of Dr. Rohling's famous work *The Talmudic Jew*.

There can be no more doubt as to the authenticity of the texts produced by the author, and even the Jews, I believe, have given up disputing it. We are certainly dealing with a priceless document that allows us to penetrate the soul – or more exactly, the brain – of the Jew, to discover his true feelings towards us and his concept of various things from the social and moral areas.

For every person capable of reflection this study sheds a shining light on the dark spots of the present time. It explains things that seemed uncertain and confusing, showing the secret logic behind the events we had trouble understanding.

"All revolutions are theological ones," rightfully says Proudhon. The general crisis faced by today's world can be briefly summed up as follows: the revenge of the Talmud upon the Gospel.

The big phrases on philosophy, on human rights or on the regeneration of mankind, which were used by the Jew in the early years of this century as a screen for his shady dealings, can no longer deceive anyone. Those ragged paper decorations are being shred to pieces now.

Today, the Jew behaves like a master, without even bothering to hide his supremacy. He rules over nations through finances; he changes labor laws to fit the interests of his syndicates; he has bought statesmen who were for sale and has driven out those he could not corrupt. He is omnipresent and omnipotent, so powerful that no one dares to attack him anymore. Just remember the agitation that seized our servile Parliament when [Francis] Laur had the courage to tell the name of the usurpers' head and publicly condemn Rothschild. All those supposedly free people, who continuously insult everything worthy of respect, everything representing faith, devotion and the ideal, such as Christ, the Pope, priests or the Sisters of Charity, started trembling like lackeys caught in the act when they saw that someone dared to attack a Frankfurt banker who has a sacrosanct status for them.

Not so long ago, careful observers alone could perceive this situation. Today, large masses of people are aware of it. Relying on the complicity of the authorities, the Jew came to strike in full daylight. He ruined one of our largest financial institutions, second only to the Bank

of France; he pillaged it from top to bottom. Several months later, a German Jew delegated by von Bismarck calmly announced his intention to shut down the Cail factory, which had the audacity to manufacture French cannons and was thus annoying the factories owned by Krupp.

The roles have been wisely distributed. At a time when the war seems inevitable in a more or less near future, one person attacks our banks, and the other goes for our factories. The former steals our money, necessary to take the field, and the latter prevents us from having cannons. All the while, the aristocracy has been exclaiming: "They're both so charming! They give magnificent garden parties!"

When you have a master, especially one you want to get rid of, first of all you need to understand him well, to know what is on his mind. This is exactly what Rohling's book has allowed the Germans to do, and your translation will now allow us to do the same.

A dominant trait of the Chosenites is the hatred and contempt for the goyim, the conviction that everything is allowed against the goy, the foreigner, the non-Jew, the "cattle semen", along with the belief that the Jews are a privileged race, one destined to bring all the other nations under its yoke, to make them work for the children of Israel.

All means are good against the despicable goy, who is not even considered to be a human being. The oath is not binding for the Jew when he deals with the goy. Every Jew who appears in court must resort to all possible tricks and lies in order to get the goy convicted, even when the poor creature is one hundred times in the right.

Armed this way, invested with a sort of mission, freed of annoying scruples of conscience by the very precepts of his religion, the Jew sets about the conquest of capitals. He is the triumphant stockbroker, the influential journalist. He is Eugène Mayer, Arthur Meyer, Jacques Meyer, Allmayer, Omni-Meyer. You cannot touch a topic anymore without finding a Meyer lurking underneath.

"The Talmud? Nah, we don't even know what it is! We've hardly read a dozen pages from it!" This is the response you'll get from Jews in the stock market, on the boulevard or at the races. And for the first time in their life they'll actually be telling the truth. Gone are the days when the Jewish patriarch, surrounded by his little children in a mysterious room that certain artists love to paint, tackled the question of whether, prior to slaughtering an animal, one must remove the phylacteries from his arm, as Rabbi Yossi bar Bun recommended it, or those from his head, as recommended by Yossi bar Nahorai [?]. Gone, too, are the days when, as related by Heinrich Heine, the Jews assembled to dine together and eat orthodox pastries after a joint reading of the

Talmudic treatise of Sium. [JRBooksOnline: Drumont must be talking about the Judaic ceremony known as Seudat Siyum (“Concluding Meal”), which takes place after a Jew has finished studying some important treatise of the Talmud. This and other similar ceremonies are still performed today.]

Indeed, why would the present-day Jews have to study the Talmud? After all, this book is imprinted in their brains by the hereditary law. It is a mental heritage passed down through countless generations, by all those who pored over the Talmudic precepts and imbibed its doctrines. The Jews are kneaded with and saturated by their Talmud. It is from there that they got the idea of being superior to us, an idea that makes them so strong. It is from there that they acquired their admirable subtlety, which consists in a complete lack of any moral sense, of any notion of right and wrong – a feature that almost disarms you for being so native and spontaneous among the Jews.

The two boulevardiers whose names have resounded everywhere last week, are they not Talmudic enough? Is there a reason *not* to regard those two moderns as the true descendants of people who spent centuries meditating upon the countless tricks and quibbles of the Shulchan Aruch? Are they not great at using paper? As it turned out, the document in question, before being delivered, was offered to Bismarck, to the sultan of Constantinople, to the emperor of Morocco, to the sovereign of Congo, etc. etc., and every time the bargaining enriched the local Jews who were involved in this affair and who, in order to carry it through, contributed the secret funds of the respective nations!

The [leather strips] that [Moses Wilhelm] Shapira claimed to be contemporaneous with the Mesha Stele, dating them to the year 2,000 [sic] before the Christian era, turned out to be a scroll of the Penta-teuch. Just as the British Museum was about to pay one million pounds for this “relic”, its experts discovered that it was actually a synagogue scroll, blackened with olive oil and shoe polish.

The two Tosaphists from Tortoni, do they not love each other deep enough? Are they not united tightly enough by the affinity of race and the ties of the Kahal? ... Just look how much admiration Jacques displays for Arthur, and how much tenderness Arthur feels for Jacques! You can see that they arduously worked together to dupe the goy... If you or I were to misappropriate [a large amount of] other people’s money, that would be qualified as an ignominious fraud and would draw universal contempt upon us. But when the Jews do it, this is merely called “having bad luck” – that is, being unlucky to have been caught.

And look how easily all those folks get out of trouble (“temporary inconveniences”, as they call it). I’ve seen vagabonds being judged,

including a guy who stole a pumpkin from a field and, desperate from hunger, ate it raw on the spot, and the court president was treating them like dogs. The guard, with handcuffs at the ready, could hardly wait to put them on the poor souls. But when the defendant is a swindler like Jacques Meyer, who became a thief not out of necessity but in order to buy an apartment valued at 50,000 francs and also to support his young ladies, the president is full of deference and hastens to say: "We're all paying homage to your loyalty."

[JRBooksOnline: Various political examples follow.]

All of this, I repeat, is a consequence of Talmudic education, the best evidence being that such habits only appeared on our political scene after the Jews had become masters in France.

Your brilliant translation of Dr. Rohling's substantial and accurate analysis will help anyone interested in these questions detect the driving force of the Jews, one that makes them so harmful and deadly – to the extent that in many cases you cannot even blame them individually for their wrongdoings, because they commit them with, as it were, smiling unconsciousness.

My dear colleague, you've asked me to explain these things to your readers, and I'm gladly fulfilling your wish, because what you're doing is right and deserves to be encouraged. You were among the first to enter this group of thoughtful persons, of unselfish patriots who have no personal ambitions but merely try to warn this unfortunate country and show it where the true danger for France lies. You brought us the enthusiasm of your youth and the aid of your knowledge of everything that concerns Germany.

If I may, I'd like to add that in doing so you almost acted against my wish. To do myself justice, I never tried to get young people involved in the active defense of my ideas, even if I consider these ideas to be absolutely right. To everyone who came to see me, I said: "You need to have a bit of financial independence and forget about any immediate success. Make no mistake: the Jew, as Disraeli said, will hinder you in everything and everywhere. He might only kill you as a last resort, but he'll certainly put stones in your path to make you fall; he'll envelop you in a tight net of his intrigues. He's the absolute master in newspapers, at universities, in public administration, in academics, in high society. For those who collude with him, everything is easy. On the other hand, everything is difficult for those who refuse to kneel before the idolatrous image of Mammon."

This is the bare truth. Trying to find any kind of help among those who are supposed to support us would be highly naïve. The old journalists, the good Christians of French stock languish in dire straits in the

middle of nowhere after defending the cause of the monarchy and that of the Church for forty years. [...]

My dear colleague, I'm glad of this occasion to have a chat with you in public... In these oscillating and perplexing times, people who have already accomplished a part of their task in life, those who are not old yet but are already elders, such people do not seem ridiculous to me when, full of cordiality and sincerity, they tell their younger friends: "This is what you're going to meet in modern society: the [hostile] mindset, the obstacles you'll have to overcome, the invisible forces you'll have to fight." [...]

The patriotic youth you are part of... wonders if it will be possible, when the declaration of war is made, to lay hands on the princes of Israel in order to make them return the billions they stole from us, and thus to fight in favorable conditions.

In fact, every single person contemplates this idea. No newspaper speaks about it, but all the journalists gossip to that effect. No member of parliament would ever dare to make a proposal of this kind from the rostrum, but you know just as well as I do that all the workers we have met at our fraternal reunions think exactly the same as we do in this regard, and they walk hand in hand with us.

The shopkeeper ruined by the monopoly of the large stores, the small investor robbed of his savings by the gangsters from the Haute Banque [group of elite banks], the worker menaced to be thrown into the street by the German Jew who made off with the shares of the Cail factory – all these people consider our solution to be the only reasonable and practical one; they are of the belief that the Jew has taken enough and it's time for him to give something back.

The Jew has not been defeated yet, sure enough, but he has been spotted. He can no longer walk surreptitiously as before. We can see him in action, we can call him by name, we can talk to him directly. We know where he lives and where we can find him so as to ask him some questions before his final relocation.

Yes, make no mistake, this is the high spot of the end of this century. The Jew is all-powerful, which must be the reason why those who want quick success, high offices, foreign missions or academic laurels have been avoiding us. At the same time, the Jew is ill enough to make our struggle feasible and give hope to those whose life has just begun, to those who have guts and who did not forget that Talleyrand's words – "Everything is yet to come!" – were said with respect to our century.

You fall into the latter category, my dear colleague. Being fond of order and methodical approach, you've wisely started with the beginning. With this quintessence of the Talmud, as it were, you've shown

us the Jew's operational base. It now remains for you to tell how the Jew puts the Talmudic precepts into practice.

Soon – very soon, I hope – we'll see how all this ends.

Édouard Drumont.

Soisy-sous-Étiolles, July 2, 1889.

INTRODUCTION

The Talmudic Jew: the war against the author. – The reason for Jewish attacks: the Jew wants to keep the Talmud under wraps. – Evidence and examples. – Talmudism is still alive today. – Continuing relevance of Rohling's work.

For more than six centuries, numerous scholars from all of Europe have been trying to reveal the mysterious dogmas and laws of the Talmud to their contemporaries. But perhaps no other book has shed so much light on this important subject as *The Talmudic Jew*, published several years ago [in 1871] by August Rohling, professor at [Charles] University in Prague. The author's rare writing talent, his deep knowledge of the rabbinical language, literature and antiquities, his valiant frankness, and last but not least, the general interest in this topic, more actual today than ever, ensured a sparkling success to this book, which quickly became a bestseller.

Alarmed at the book's rapid and massive distribution, the Jews decided to get rid of such an irritating truth-teller. To achieve this goal, they made use of every single means known to them.

To start with, Rohling saw himself simultaneously attacked from all sides by a swarm of scribblers, ones that Jewry always had aplenty. Some pretended to have exposed him of ignorance, while others accused him of distorting and falsifying texts, and all of them shouted in unison that we were dealing with a backward witch hunter, a fanatic driven by shameful hatred, a lunatic whose mind was affected by the legends of dark medieval times, a bigot who was a disgrace for the 19th century and for all mankind.

In *Seder ha-Doroth* (p. 258), we read that one day Rabbi Josiah – most probably after collecting profits from some lucrative enterprise – was assailed on the road by a gang of 400 brigands. Without the divine aid, the holy man was surely lost, so he fell on his knees and received from above a miraculous force, which allowed him to draw such a powerful odor from his body that all the brigands passed out; moreover, the odor spread over the ocean and choked all those who happened to be on the sea at that time.

In this regard, the Jews have remained true to themselves, and Rohling learned from personal experience that in their conflicts with us the old Jewish manner of acting was still their best and only one.

Try to rectify some historical lie; attempt, for example, a timid rehabilitation of your race and your forefathers; imply that you descend from people who perhaps were not idiots, robbers or murderers. – You'll be distorting history; you'll be shamelessly lying to yourself; ignorance and fanaticism will be speaking through your mouth.

Try to doubt the benevolence of the rabbis who composed the Talmud and the goodwill of the Jews who turned it into their [moral and legal] code. – You'll be a dark persecutor, a person who insults innocent victims, an apostle of obscurantism, a dreadful bloodthirsty man.

Try to say that today's Jews are indeed heirs to the Jews of the past, and therefore certain safety measures against them might be justified after all. – You'll be a person consumed by base envy and vile greed; you'll be a disgrace for your time, the scum of mankind, the refuse of nature; in short, you'll receive on your head all the contents of the chamber pot that every Jewish polemicist always carries with him.

However, none of this hubbub disquieted Rohling very much. Convinced of the righteousness of his cause and driven by his knowledge and the truth, he bravely stood up to the throng of his enemies. The Jews bitterly realized that it would be difficult to overcome such a formidable adversary, and since the left-handed blow is their favorite, they resorted to it once again. They entrusted the case to the Austrian government, which obligingly deprived Rohling of the right to speak and forbade him to respond.

Awkwardly fencing with the right hand, the Jews kept a close eye on their adversary's weapon, skillfully parried with the left hand, and freely hit a man who had been treacherously disarmed. Sure enough, all that time they kept screaming about fanaticism and persecution, swearing that it was them who were being attacked.

All this has recently made a great noise in Vienna and in Germany. But we only want to draw one conclusion from this curious and instructive case, namely that Judaism does everything to prevent the basis of its beliefs, morals and laws from being elucidated. While all the other nations walk with their banner blowing in the wind and openly display their gospel and their legal code, the Jew shrouds himself in darkness and mystery, keeping his civil and religious laws a deep secret, one that must remain confined within the Jewish family at all costs, and it is a sacred duty of every single Jew to eternally lie to people of other races and nations [with regard to the Talmud].

The fact is that the Talmud is par excellence the book of exclusiveness, separatism and universal hatred – not only against all the other religions, but also against all the nations from the human family, against their property, against their social and national existence. Whoever

takes the trouble to browse through this work will have no doubt left in this regard, we can safely say that.

Therefore, anyone who is curious enough to lift the veil, perspicacious enough to see the reality, candid enough to tell what he saw – such a person becomes a dangerous enemy that must be got rid of at all costs, or at least silenced, whatever it may take.

This is why the non-Jew who studies the Talmud, as well as the Jew who teaches it to him, deserves death according to Talmudic laws.

This is why the Jew who imparts the knowledge of his sacred books to a non-Jew must be punished as an informer, and consequently put to death.

This is why the Jew who is asked about the meaning of a passage from his sacred books must falsely interpret the text, because, first, it is forbidden to increase the knowledge of a foreigner, and secondly, the Jew who discloses the secrets of his law to a non-Jew deserves death. A curious commentary is made in this regard [by a Jewish author]: “This would be equivalent to exterminating all the Jews, because if non-Jews were to discover what we teach about them, they would hasten to put us to death.”

This is why the rabbis teach that every Jew must swear and declare under any kind of oath that the sacred Jewish books contain nothing against foreign nations.

* * *

It is little wonder that nearly every attempt to bring this important topic to public knowledge has had mediocre and insufficient results. Almost invariably, Judaic cunning and power have come into play at the right moment to muffle the author's voice, to do away with his book, and quite often to do away with the author himself.

Old Eisenmenger had his book confiscated at first, and then, after it was established that what he had written was perfectly true, the Jews offered him 10,000 thalers – a considerable amount of money for those days – if he agreed to stop the publication of his book.

Another scholar, Raabe, who translated the Mishnah, received an offer of 3,000 thalers from a Mannheim Jew, along with that of a nice villa on the Rhine shore, if he withdrew his book from print.

Brafman, to whom we owe extremely interesting revelations on present-day rabbinism, died in a very strange manner, which leaves no doubt that he was poisoned in accordance with Talmudic laws.

A similar fate befell Dr. Pinner, who was stricken with death just as he was completing his translation of the first Talmudic treatise.

One Sunday morning, G. des Mousseaux received a note informing him that he had just been sentenced to death and would soon be executed. The following Monday, he suddenly died. As to his book, the first edition, almost all its copies made their way from the publishing house into the back of a second-hand bookstore on Casimir-Delavigne Street [in Paris], where they disappeared without a trace.

Nobody can tell what has become of Achille Laurent's *Relation historique des Affaires de Syrie*, a collection of documents that spelled disaster for Judaism. You cannot find it anywhere today.

Just recently, a learned Basel society embarked on a complete translation of the Shulchan Aruch. It was a purely scholarly work rather than an "anti-Semitic" act, but nevertheless all the great rabbis of Germany and other countries hastened to let everyone know that contributing to this enterprise by buying the publication would be a mortal sin.

Among the countless cases of this kind, that of Dr. Briman and a Jew named Elbogen deserves a special mention.

Briman, too, attempted a full translation of the Talmud. In addition, his reputation of a competent judge in rabbinical literature drew the attention of Rohling. Briman was asked by Rohling to give an expert opinion on the veracity of his writings and publish a report in this regard.

Just at that time, Briman was sued for insults by a lady, to whom he had supposedly talked in not very gallant terms. It was under these circumstances that Briman was called by Elbogen and had a rather curious conversation with him. Here are the details, as told by Briman himself.

* * *

On the Friday of January 9, between five and six o'clock in the evening, I came to the office of Fr. Elbogen. There, I also found Dr. Kopp and two persons I was not familiar with. As I entered the room, Elbogen received me by saying:

"Mr. Briman, I'm very grateful for your visit. I've been hearing about you for a long time, but until now I've had no chance to meet you. Just this morning, I came back from Innsbruck, where Mr. Kopp and I had gone to gather some documents against you. You can see them here on the table. I thought it was a good occasion to ask you to come by. First off, I need to let you know that I've been charged with representing the interests of Mrs. N., whom you supposedly insulted. Next, I'd like to ask you if you're the author of the books *The Jewish Mirror* and *Talmudic Wisdom*?"

I said I was indeed.

"But tell me," continued Elbogen, "how can you be so resolute to expose us all to the danger of being exterminated? I am a Jew, and I know nothing worse than *The Jewish Mirror*."

I responded: "If the publication of *The Jewish Mirror* were to have unpleasant consequences for Jews, I'd regret that, because I never had the intention to persecute any of them. I wrote that book for the sole purpose of informing non-Jews, as well as honest Jews, about the effects of Talmudism and its teachings. Besides, nobody could claim that I wrote a word that wasn't true."

"But tell me, why are you an anti-Semite?"

"Sir, I barely know you to discuss such things with you."

"Huh, I can already see that you're fancy. I'd like to speak frankly to you. Tell me, do you know Rohling?"

"I do."

"Did you write his books for him?"

"I certainly did not. I already made that clear."

"But how can it be that Rohling writes books like that? He knows nothing about this stuff."

"I know Rohling very well, and I can assure you that he has excellent knowledge of these things. He could easily compete with the most learned rabbis."

"Did Rohling ever write to you asking you to give an expert opinion on his works?"

"He did."

"You're surely a big friend of Rohling's, and you're itching to defend him, isn't that so?"

"Definitely not. I'm actually at odds with him."

"But if you were formally asked to give an expert opinion, would it be one favorable to Rohling or one against him?"

"I'd give it in accordance with the truth and my beliefs. I wouldn't depart an iota from the truth, be it to please my friends or harm my enemies."

"Oh well, let me tell you how things stand. Kopp and I went yesterday to Innsbruck in order to do away with your translation of the Talmud. That very evening, at six o'clock, I spoke with your publisher, and he assured me that your translation wouldn't come out. You know that I've been charged to act against you in court, and rest assured that we're prepared to use every single means *to destroy you both morally and physically*. After all, it's you who wants to destroy us in the first place. However, that will only happen if you continue working against us like you've been doing so far. But if you agree to work against

Rohling, we'll make sure to provide you with solid means of subsistence. How much money do you plan to receive for your translation of the Talmud?"

"About 12,000 guildens."

"Well, we'll give you exactly 12,000 guildens if you abandon your translation. Really, it's an astonishing disgrace that the government supports such a venture. Do you still have Rohling's letter where he asks you to give an expert opinion?"

"I do."

"Ask anything you want, and we'll give it to you at the very moment you publish that letter."

"I deeply regret that you think me capable of such a thing."

"In that case, let's take a cab and go to you so you could at least show me Rohling's letter. Let's be friends: if you do me that pleasure, I'll bring the lady's entire case to naught, and if she continues bothering you, I'll become your lawyer."

I excused myself by saying that I could not go home right now and that one of my stenographers was waiting for me outside to accompany me to some place.

* * *

The above scene gives us a perfect model of Judaic cunning in action, as well as a memorable example of obstinacy with which the Jew stifles the truth when it bothers him. But most importantly, it provides irrefutable evidence that Talmudism is far from being obsolete, as some people claim. No, it is modern and alive, being known and practiced by the most enlightened Jews of our time.

When the rabbis of the Talmud and their medieval disciples taught that the foreigner who dared to study their law deserved to be killed, did they speak differently than the above lawyer, who declares himself prepared to destroy such a person morally and physically?

When the same scholars taught that the Jew must never lose a trial, and that the case must be decided in his favor based on the Jewish law if this law is the one in force, based on the foreign law if the case is heard in a foreign country, or through skilful intrigues if the desired outcome cannot be achieved by lawful means, how did their line of conduct differ from that of their today's disciple?

When the Talmud says that slapping a Jew is like slapping a divine being, in what does this language differ from that of Elbogen, who sees an astonishing disgrace in the independent work of a conscientious au-

thor, or from that of the rabbis of any country, in whose eyes anyone who looks askance at a Jew is a dishonor for his time and a disgrace for mankind?

Really, the Jews simply make fun of us when they swear that the Talmud has been buried for centuries.

Yes, it can be conceded that a good many Jews take lightly certain observances that are little convenient for our times and circumstances, but it is impossible to believe that they have actually burned a book that was so much worshipped in the past, that they have renounced its spirit and unlearned its teachings.

Indeed, if there was nothing left in common between the old Talmudist and the modern Jew, the latter would not feel himself so terribly offended every time someone revealed the little secrets of the former. The reformed Jew would content himself with saying something like this: "It is true, our ancestors did have rather peculiar ideas with regard to you, to your property, your women or your status as a human being, and they were malicious enough to put those ideas in practice whenever they could. We recognize that. However, those people have long been dead. An interval of centuries separates us from them. The world has greatly changed, and so have we. Feel free to speak about them however you wish – that does not bother us, nor does it have anything to do with us. We do not care about your words, because we are not involved in those things. As to those of our brothers who still persist in the errors of the past, we disown them as well. We are too enlightened, too philosophical, too liberal, too modern, too much like you to stay in their company and thus discredit ourselves. *You* deal with them."

That would be the most efficient way to prove that the Talmud has indeed been repudiated and buried. However, the Jews have carefully avoided giving us this proof.

Today more than ever the ties of solidarity are close and solid.

More than ever the "enlightened" and "reformed" Jew disowns Talmudism of the past and that of today for the sake of appearances only, with empty and lying phrases.

Not once did he miss an opportunity to join his cause with that of the most avowed fanatics.

Not once did the Alliance Israélite Universelle think of saying: "We do not want Talmudists among us; we do not want obstinate fanatics who still cling to the old laws."

Quite the contrary, the Alliance has been opening its arms to traffickers of women, to professional usurers, or to vile human sacrificers of Romania, Galicia and other places with so much love that you would think those were some learned philosophers.

Every time any of the above-mentioned specimens aroused universal indignation after being caught in some immoral or criminal activity, it was not Polish or Oriental down-and-outs who stopped the arm of justice. No, it was the likes of Crémieux and Montefiore who did it; it was humanitarian and philosophical Jews who shook heaven and earth to save the culprits and who openly declared through their actions that hitting the murderers of young Christian girls, the butchers of human flesh, those who sacrifice people at Passover is equivalent to hitting the entire modern Judaism right in the heart.

It should also be mentioned that the Talmud has never stopped being published and therefore read. Ever since the famous execution in 1254, when the French king ordered that all the copies of this monstrous book be confiscated [and burned], the rabbis have been writing without respite, and there has been no century (ours included) that did not see a good number of new treatises or editions of the Talmud.

Furthermore, if we were to imagine that the Catholic Church came to reject the Gospel or Saint Paul's Epistles or, say, the treatises of Father Gury [Jesuit scholar], such an event would not pass unnoticed and history would certainly record that in a certain year, based on a certain papal decree or a certain decision of the ecumenical council, the book in question was forever removed from Christian doctrines and morals. At the very least, we would know the approximate time when this epochal decision was made.

Now, as far as our good Jews are concerned, the only time this kind of question was raised was during the general Jewish synod held as late as in 1866. On that occasion, it was decreed that *in the eyes of [i.e., before] Christians*, the Shulchan Aruch has to be repudiated, but *in reality* every Jew must comply with its laws in all countries and at all times. The decision was signed by 94 rabbis, 182 lawyers, 45 physicians and 11,672 Jews of various qualities. (See the Shulchan Aruch edition printed in Lemberg [Lviv] in 1873.)

These facts speak for themselves, and if something were to contradict them, that would certainly *not* be the statements of people who have the sacred duty – one prescribed by their law – to lie and perjure when it comes to concealing the teachings of their scholars.

Therefore, we have the certainty that by presenting a faithful portrait of the Talmudic Jew to our readers we do not resurrect a character of past centuries, nor do we rejuvenate a decrepit figure or dig out some extinct relic. The Talmudic Jew is just as alive today as he was yesterday, and the German legend of the Wandering Jew was perfectly right in naming its hero the Eternal Jew.

* * *

All this being said, it is essential to know the main prescriptions of the Talmudic law with regard to us, so as to be able to rightly appreciate the actions of modern Judaism.

The Talmud alone can allow us to do it. The Talmud alone can let us put together facts and estimate their consequences. The Talmud alone can make us foresee what the near future logically and fatally has in store for us if the national sentiment and the simple instinct of self-preservation do not awaken the way they did in days of old, when the French nation, in concert with its kings, used to bring the Jew into line.

The Talmud, already in full development at the arrival of Jesus Christ, was completed by the early 6th century. Therefore – let us say this in passing – it was not the supposed medieval persecution of the Jews that created the Talmudic spirit: this spirit had already existed before the Middle Ages. The time when France squared up to the Jews was precisely the one when thousands of Talmudic commentators were teaching in the synagogues spread all over our country that Christians and Frenchmen were nothing but beasts of burden or slaves, that their life was not worth more than that of a fly, that their money and lands were bequeathed to the Jews since time immemorial, or that their daughters were merely an instrument of Jewish pleasure. Consequently, if the French people took a stand, they had every right to do so; if they hit, it was their duty to do it, and we are grateful to our ancestors for having preserved our motherland and passed it down to us. God willing, we shall preserve it for the Frenchmen of tomorrow by unmasking modern Talmudism and fighting against it with all our might until our land becomes free of it again.

Technicalities

In his wish to ensure a wide distribution of his book, Dr. Rohling decided not to reserve any reprint or translation rights for himself. As a result, we can offer this highly interesting work to our compatriots without asking for permission to do so. The bold and generous scholar would certainly have granted it to us, but it would have greatly compromised him in the eyes of various members of the Austrian government.

Making use of the liberty given to us, we have expanded the last edition of Rohling's book with some pertinent texts borrowed from various recent publications, particularly the following:

1) August Rohling, *Die Polemik und das Menschenopfer des Rabbinismus*, Paderborn, Bonifacius-Druckerei, 1884;

2) Clemens Victor [pseudonym of A. Rohling], *Prof. Dr. Rohling, die Judenfrage und die öffentliche Meinung*, Leipzig, Th. Fritsch, 1887;

3) Christian Radenhausen, *Esther: Die semitische Unmoral im Kampfe wider Staat und Kirche*, Leipzig, Theile, 1887.

A. Pontigny.

PART ONE

OVERVIEW OF THE TALMUD

CHAPTER 1

TALMUDISM

Orthodox and reformed Jews. – Two kinds of reformed Jews. – The inconsistency of both kinds of Reformers. – Orthodox Jews. – The basic principle and birth of Talmudism.

For some years, a big intellectual movement has been underway among the Western Jews. While in the Orient, save for a small number of dissidents, such as the Karaites, the Jews continue to swear on the Talmud rather than on the Bible, in Europe we can hear the Jewish call for the religious progress of their nation coming from all sides, with more or less force.

Everyone wants to call himself an orthodox Jew, but the old Orthodoxes refuse to treat the Progressives other than as bad reformers. Now, the color of the latter is not always the same.

Some of the Reformists are not afraid to make the Talmud responsible for every Jewish suffering of the past, borrowing the following slogan from Sieyès: "What it used to be? Everything. What it must become? Nothing." [1] They exclaim to old believers: "Your observances are obsolete; they prevent Judaism from becoming acceptable." [2] Or: "The old system, which wants to preserve the Talmudic delusions and which is an obstacle for the future of Judaism, must be discarded." [3]

They do not stop there and declare that in order to be a good Jew it is enough to accept three dogmas: that of the unity of God, that of God's immortality [sic; immateriality], and that of the immortality of the soul. [4]

They add that every one of us is the supreme judge in matters of conscience, [5] and they ask Jews, Christians and Muslims alike to shed all the outward forms of their religions and come together in the belief in the unity of God and in universal brotherhood. [6]

Other Reformists are more moderate. They say that Talmudism is something venerable rather than divine, and that the Talmud is no longer the book of law for Jews, but merely one worthy of respect.

In public, they try hard to whitewash the Talmud of any blemish,[7] but in their scholarly works they acknowledge that it contains "both lofty and low teachings, both Judaic and pagan ones, as well as numerous statements and prescriptions that are little tolerant of people who belong to other nations or religions".[8]

They do not dispute the inspired character of the Bible, and they advocate "universal philanthropy" as the fundamental Jewish idea.[9]

Both systems are rather faulty, and the latter is merely a golden mean, an interim solution that will logically lead to the former sooner or later. The two systems walk hand in hand, belong to the same family, and the orthodox voice of *L'Univers Israélite* reproaches both of them as follows: "Moses and the Talmud are no longer to your liking; Judaism is no longer your religion but rather an antiquity and a dead thing; you walk on the ground of paganism instead of keeping watch next to Jerusalem." [10]

Orthodox Judaism reasonably argued that a living divine authority was necessary to guide minds, and that once a revelation was made, it needed an infallible throne which would survive through all generations to the very end and whose goal would be to interpret and convey the true meaning of the word of God, to adapt it to the changing circumstances of life and the world, and to guard it from the influence of passions and prejudices, which are always a threat to human judgment.

In the ancient synagogue, the priesthood was the ordinary guardian of the faith, while the prophets were its extraordinary interpreters. The high priest had the divine prerogative to infallibly transmit God's will in matters that concerned the theocracy's general wellbeing.

After Jesus Christ, the synagogue preserved the principle of a living authority, but at the same time extended this principle to include each of its individual members [i.e., scholars]. It even went so far as to declare their most ordinary talks and conversations, as well as their most contradictory statements, to be the words of God and absolute truths.

An overinflated ego underlay this incomprehensible theory, and as it normally happens, this ego led to a most astonishing moral decadence. Rabbinism came to develop a set of morals that could only be matched by the lowest forms of paganism. It is now one single organism where fraud, theft, lies, murder and adultery are tightly held together not unlike the links of a chain.

The Pharisees were the fathers of this hideous monster, so when Jesus Christ calls them the devil's children or a brood of snakes and vipers, we can easily understand our Savior's terrible insults. At the same

time, it might be difficult to comprehend how a rational and sensible Jew could doubt that by rejecting Christ the Jews have actually rejected the truth.

Such are the conclusions that inevitably follow from a mere examination of the Jewish religious books lying open in front of us. Therefore, it is only logical that if a Jew driven by the movement which is taking place today within his nation fails to approach the true Church, one founded by the Nazarene, he will come to deny all revelations, including those of the Old Testament, and will fatally end up engulfed by pure rationalism.

This state of affairs is more than enough to justify our project, whose goal is to make a call to the conscience of Jews by showing them a true picture of rabbinic errors.

Now, if the reformed Jew were to claim that he sees nothing divine in rabbinism, we would respond to him as follows: "Still, it is in the synagogue that you want to save your soul, and since one knows a tree by its fruit, you must logically conclude that the synagogue, which borrowed and grew the fruits of hell, is just as little capable of ensuring the salvation of your soul as that philosopher who used to worship Hercules but then, after failing to find the Lord in his idol, threw it into the fire with the words: 'And now, Hercules, perform your 13th labor and help me cook my vegetables!' "

In fact, both this philosopher with his idolatrous cult and the synagogue with its all too pagan doctrine have proven to be fallible authorities, ones subject to error and therefore incapable of providing the rule of truth at any time and in any place as conscience demands, a rule that would be pure and unblemished.

By continuing to consider themselves supreme judges in matters of salvation and in those of the soul, they basically reinstate the idol they once threw into the fire, worshipping it under a different name this time. This new name is humanism, and it is nothing but a disguise for the old misery of the weak *genus humanum*, of man that is self-sufficient, of man that worships himself and thereby falls into the servitude of evil and error.

Next, it has to be agreed that the synagogue lost the truth when it rejected the Nazarene, for it was from that moment on that it started producing the blasphemous doctrines and morals that can be found in all its books.

You also have to be aware, dear reader, that even though the reformed Jew keeps claiming that he sees nothing divine in the Talmud, he stills swears on this book whenever an opportunity presents itself, thereby treating it as the book of law and putting it above the Bible.[11]

Nor should we lose sight of the manner in which the spiritual heads of Israel, the rabbis, are taught. Unsurprisingly, the main subject of study in rabbinic seminaries is the Talmud.

Furthermore, our cities are teeming with so-called Talmudic societies, where, under the presidency and direction of rabbis, members of Jewish communities can directly read the Talmud and draw from primary sources. A society of this kind has existed in Berlin for 35 years, and every evening its members have been meeting to read the "holy" books.

This way, even if many Jewish traders have never seen the Talmud with their own eyes, they have enough brethren who can initiate them into Talmudic teachings.

The purpose of those studies can only be putting the Talmudic doctrines into practice, otherwise what would be the point of them?

All the above facts are in agreement with the categorical statement of the reformed Jews from *Archives Israélites*: "As to the Talmud, we recognize its absolute superiority over Moses' book of law." [12]

Dr. Kroner, in fact, equally adheres to the old doctrine that puts the Talmud above the Bible, for more than once he fully approves of Talmudic statements that are in open contradiction to the Bible. Thus, he believes that a Jew who steals from a non-Jew or dishonors a non-Jewish woman should not be convicted by a Jewish court, the reason being that the Talmud says so, and he even argues that this way the Jews actually preserve the Bible through the Talmud!

A rather peculiar preservation, is it not? A law that is supposed to apply to every person in his or her relations with other people is being limited to relations between Jews only, every time a fair court verdict could menace the Jewish purse or life.

The existence of these fallacious beliefs convincingly proves that man needs a divine and infallible authority in order to preserve the true meaning of the Bible and protect it from distortion in matters of faith and morals. Besides, it would be truly astonishing if a human work had the mission to protect a divine work embodied in the Holy Scriptures.

NOTES

[1] *Archives Israélites*, 1867, No. 12, p. 545.

[2] *Ibid.*, 1867, No. 10, p. 448.

[3] *Ibid.*, 1868, No. 12, p. 533.

[4] *Ibid.*, 1868, No. 3, pp. 117–118.

[5] *Ibid.*, 1867, No. 15, p. 677.

[6] *Ibid.*, 1866, No. 14, pp. 628–629.

[7] Kroner in *W[estfälischer] Merkur*, 1871, Nos. 128 and 130, as well as in his response to *The Talmudic Jew*.

[8] Graetz, *History of the Jews*, vol. IV, p. 410.

[9] Kroner.

[10] Passim. [*Archives Israélites*, 1866, No. 12, pp. 563, 588.]

[11] *Archives Israélites*, 1864, pp. 149–153.

[12] Ibid.

CHAPTER 2

DEVELOPMENT OF THE TALMUD

How the Talmud came into being. – Its composition. – Tricks used by rabbis to hide their teachings from Christians. – Various editions of the Talmud.

The present-day synagogue is a legitimate daughter of the Pharisean school [of thought] and a natural heir to the teachings spread by the Pharisees among the Jews during Jesus Christ's time and in the following years.

Around 150 A.D., a rabbi named Judah [ha-Nasi], fearing that those teachings would be lost, put them together in a book that received the name of Mishnah, which means the repeated, or second, law, because it somewhat repeats the first law, that is, the five books of Moses. In fact, the purpose of the Mishnah is to explain the difficult parts of the law of Moses, as well as to fill in its supposed lacunae.

In the centuries that followed, the Mishnah was expanded with various commentaries written in the Jewish schools of Palestine and Babylon. These interpretations of the Mishnah are called the Gemara. Together with the Mishnah (or sometimes even taken alone), they form the Talmud, a book of Jewish doctrines and morals.

The commentaries completed in Palestine around 230 A.D. are a folio in size and make up the Jerusalem Talmud. The Babylonian Gemara, with or without the Mishnah, forms the Babylonian Talmud. The Gemara was completed around the year 500, and it consists of as many as 14 folios.

It is the Babylonian Talmud that is particularly venerated by the Jews, being the one referred to if the Jerusalem Talmud is not explicitly mentioned by name.

As we open any edition of the Talmud printed during the last 200 years, we might be astonished to discover a large number of sheets with entire passages left blank or replaced with a circle. In the older editions, however, these places contain insults and blasphemies against Jesus Christ, the Virgin Mary and the apostles, as well as statements that everything taught by the Talmud with regard to non-Jews – who are called *goyim*, strangers, foreigners, heretics, etc. – refers above all to Christians.

Sure enough, when Christians learned about these things, they openly expressed their indignation, so the Jewish synod held in Poland in 1631 decreed that in the future all passages of this kind were to be replaced either with a circle or with a blank space, and that all such teachings – for example, that Christians are lost in vices, that one should not love them as neighbors, that they do not deserve justice, etc. – could only be taught orally in Jewish schools.[1][2]

All the same, Hartwig von Hundt-Radowsky [German lawyer and author] says that even if some of today's Jews have never seen the Talmud, those who *are* familiar with it spread its harmful principles as divine prescriptions among their coreligionists, who imbibe those teachings and all too often put them into practice. This is a fact proven by experience.[3]

Let us conclude by listing the editions we have used for this book: the unexpurgated edition published in Venice,[4] the Amsterdam edition published in 1644 (already truncated in many places), and three mutilated editions printed in Sulzbach (1769), Warsaw (1863) and Prague (1839). The mode of referencing is the same for all editions, and when a note says "Ven.," this means that the respective quotation is missing in all the above editions save for that of Venice.

NOTES

[1] See the acts of the synod in G. des Mousseaux, *Le Juif*, Paris, 1869, p. 100.

[2] JRBooksOnline: Exact quotation from G. des Mousseaux with regard to Christians: "Christians are depicted as persons that indulge in the most abominable vices, and it is stated that not only are the precepts of justice, equity or charity towards the neighbor *not* applicable to them, but [such acts are considered] a crime."

[3] *Neuer Judenspiegel*, Cannstadt, [1828], p. 174.

[4] JRBooksOnline: The German text mentions that the Venice edition printed in 1520 and the one printed in Amsterdam in 1600 are complete.

CHAPTER 3

A SACRED BOOK FOR JEWS

Superiority of the Talmud over the Bible. – Infallibility of rabbis. – Everything a rabbi says is the word of God. – A rabbi's donkey.

Save for a few dissidents, the Jews have always regarded the Talmud as a book no less divine than the Bible of the Old Testament. At a close examination, we can actually see that they put the Talmud well above the Bible.

The Talmud claims that its different sections were already defined by Isaiah (33:6).[1] It also says, with regard to itself, that "the words of oral tradition are equal to those of the law".[2]

Elsewhere the Talmud says: "The Bible is like water, the Mishnah is like wine, and the Gemara is like aromatic wine. The world cannot exist without water, wine or aromatic wine, and a rich man would not disregard any of these. Hence, the world cannot exist without the Bible, the Mishnah or the Gemara either. Next, the Law is like salt, the Mishnah is like pepper, and the Gemara is like spice. The world cannot exist without salt, etc."[3]

The Talmud further says: "Those who study the Bible perform an action that may or may not be a virtue, those who study the Mishnah perform a virtue and will be rewarded, and those who study the Gemara perform the highest virtue."[4]

Also: "Anyone who despises the rabbis' words deserves death."[5] Or: "If a man moves from Talmudic precepts and teachings to those of the Bible, he will have no happiness anymore."[6] The reason is this: "The words of Talmudic scholars are sweeter than those of the law."[7] Therefore: "Sins against the Talmud are more serious than sins against the Bible."[8]

The statements of various Jewish scholars fully agree with those made by the Talmud. Thus, Bechai says: "If someone has the Bible and the Mishnah in his hands, but not the Talmud, one should not communicate with him."[9] Rashi, another famous rabbi, says as follows, also in agreement with the Talmud: "My son, pay more attention to the words of rabbis than to those of the law."[10]

Elsewhere, we find a remarkable commentary on the [biblical] statement that man does not live on bread alone [but on every word that

comes from the mouth of the Lord]: supposedly, bread means the Bible, while “every word that comes from the mouth of the Lord” refers to the Talmudic sentences, tales and fables.[11]

In a rabbinical book written in 1500, the above Talmudic thesis is supported by the words that “a man who reads the Bible without the Mishnah and the Gemara is just like one who has no God”.[12]

We are openly told: “On the Sinai, God gave the law in the following order: the Bible, the Mishnah and the Gemara with the Aggadah [tales and fables]. Now, he imparted the Talmud by word of mouth, through Moses, so that if the nations of the earth came to subjugate Israel, there would remain a difference between Israel and the idolaters.”[13] Another reason is this: “If God had put the Talmud in writing, it would have gone beyond the boundaries of the earth.”[14]

In our wish to show how much authority is enjoyed by the Talmud, we have quoted the statements of rabbis who did not actually compose the Talmud. We have done so not without reason. First, since the Talmud cannot possibly be the word of God due to the things it contains, it basically means that the rabbis are all the same regardless of when they lived, because they all interpreted a revelation. And secondly, it is directly said that all the rabbis, including those of today, are endowed with a divine authority, and therefore everything they say is the word of God.

Rabbi Menachem lets us know, in agreement with many other of his colleagues, that “God often consults rabbis on the earth when a difficult topic is brought up in heaven”.[15] Wrongly interpreting a sentence from Proverbs 11:25 [“A generous person will prosper; whoever refreshes others will be refreshed.”], the Talmud claims that the deceased rabbis of all generations teach the chosen ones in heaven.[16]

Next, a Jewish book printed in 1590 says: “You need to know that the rabbis’ words are sweeter than those of the prophets.”[17]

Moreover, “a simple conversation between rabbis must be respected the same as the entire law”,[18] because “the rabbis’ words are the words of the living God”.[19]

Consequently, “if a rabbi tells you that your right hand is left, and your left hand is right, you should not turn away from his words, and even more so when he tells you that your right hand is right, and your left hand is left.”[20]

Maimonides, a scholar also known as the Eagle of the Synagogue, who died in the early 13th century, said: “The fear of a rabbi is the fear of God.”[21]

What we have just heard from rabbis of later generations can also be found in the Talmud itself: “One who contradicts his rabbi or tea-

cher, argues with him or murmurs against him is just as guilty as if he contradicted, argued with or murmured against a divine authority.”[22]

Now, the trouble is that rabbis, too, happen to contradict each other. Menachem overcame this difficulty by making a rather astonishing claim: Just like the words of prophets, all the words of rabbis, no matter from what period or generation, are the words of God, even when they contradict and exclude each other. This is why anyone who contradicts rabbis, argues with them or murmurs against them commits a sin just as great as if he did those things to God.[23]

Similarly, a lot of Jewish books claim that the rabbis’ most contradictory words and explanations come from heaven, and therefore one who despises them will be thrown into the boiling mud of hell.[24]

The rabbis who composed the Talmud demand the same blind faith in their contradictory statements. For instance, the Talmud describes at length the eternal disputes between the schools of Hillel and Shammai. Whether it is a matter of a fly or a camel, whether serious or trivial questions are discussed, the opinions of the two schools are obstinately opposed, but nevertheless the Talmud adds that both the teachings of Shammai and those of Hillel are the words of God.[25]

One day, Rabbi Chaya swore before God that a rabbi said such and such thing, but Bar Kappara equally swore before God that the rabbi in question said something exactly opposite. Still, Rashi argues that both rabbis told the truth, because it is said that God makes it impossible for a rabbi to err.[26]

The Talmud says that even a voice coming from heaven would not be able to dispute a rabbi’s teaching.[27] Once, God himself took the side of a rabbi during a discussion and eventually had to admit defeat to the rabbi’s opponent.[28] This infallibility goes so far as to form a nimbus around a rabbi’s head, and even a rabbi’s donkey cannot possibly partake of a forbidden food.[29]

Elsewhere, it is discussed how the law must be recognized when opinions are contradictory. The answer is truly remarkable: “All those words come from God; therefore, get yourself ears similar to a funnel, and a heart that listens to the words of those who forbid and of those who allow.”[30]

In plain language, this means: Do anything you want provided that you can do it.

In view of this, if a dignified and honest voice were to emerge in the bosom of rabbinism, calling for righteousness and truth, the Talmudic Jew would not be bound by it, because the contradictory teachings of rabbis are equally divine.

Thus, we will repeatedly see the Talmud openly saying that it is allowed to do harm as long as it can be done in secret.[31]

Since both the Talmudic rabbis and those of later centuries regard themselves as divine persons and shamelessly claim that their most glaring contradictions are the words of God, we will make no distinction between them and will resort to the statements of both groups while shedding light on the doctrines and morals of the Talmudic Jew.

NOTES

- [1] Tr. Shabbat, f. 31, col. 1.
- [2] Tr. Rosh Hashanah, 19, 1.
- [3] Soferim, 13, 2.
- [4] Tr. Baba Metzia, f. 33, 1.
- [5] Tr. Erubin, 21, 2.
- [6] Tr. Chagigah, f. 10, 2.
- [7] Jerusalem Talmud, Berakhot, ch. 1, f. 3.
- [8] Tr. Sanhedrin, f. 88, 2.
- [9] Sefer Kad ha-Kemach, f. 77, 3, by Bechai, a famous rabbi, in the late 13th century [1291].
- [10] On Gittin, f. 57, 1 [59, 2]; Erubin, 21, 2.
- [11] Menorat ha-Maor on Deuteronomy 8:3 (c. 1470).
- [12] Shaarei Tzedek, f. 9.
- [13] Berakhot, f. 5 and Midrash Rabba, par. 47, on Shemot [Exodus], f. 131, 2 (c. 300 A.D.).
- [14] Sefer Yuchasin, f. 160 (c. 1500 A.D.).
- [15] On the Pentateuch, par. 28, f. 129, col. 3.
- [16] Tr. Sanhedrin, f. 92, 1.
- [17] Kaftor u-Perach, f. 121.
- [18] Midrash Mishlei, f. 1. (Ven. 1546.)
- [19] Bechai on the Pentateuch, par. 44, f. 201, col. 4.
- [20] Rashi on Deuteronomy 17:11.
- [21] Yad ha-Chazakah, Talmud Torah, 5, 1.
- [22] Tr. Sanhedrin, f. 110, 1.
- [23] On Exodus 20:1, f. 98, par. 31.
- [24] For ex., Leb Aryeh (Ven. 1650), f. 96, 4; Megaleh Amukot, f. 3, 2, ofan 9; Yalkut Chadash, f. 155, 1, No. 34 (Krakow, 1595).
- [25] Erubin, f. 13, 2.
- [26] *Prof. Dr. Rohling*, pp. 73–74.
- [27] *Ibid.*, p. 74.
- [28] *Ibid.*
- [29] *Ibid.*
- [30] Tr. Chagigah, f. 3, 2.
- [31] Tr. Chagigah, f. 16, 1; Kiddushin, f. 40, 1.

PART TWO

CORRUPTION OF DOCTRINES

CHAPTER 1

THE GOD OF THE TALMUD

What God does in heaven. – The Leviathan and his spouse. – God's sins and his bitter repentance. – Eli's lion. – Why the earth trembles. – Complaints of the moon. – God's other faults.

— The Talmud says: "A day consists of twelve hours. During the first three hours, God sits and studies the law; during the next three hours, he judges; during the other three, he feeds the entire world; and during the last three, he sits and plays with the Leviathan, king of the fish." [1] During the night, adds Menachem, God studies the Talmud. [2]

The heavenly school attended by God and angels is also open to Asmodeus, king of demons, who, as we can learn from the Talmud, rises to the firmament every day to study there. [3]

As to the Leviathan, the Talmud says that a fish 300 miles long would easily fit into his mouth. Due to his enormous size, God thought it necessary to take his spouse away, because otherwise the world would have been filled with monsters that would have exterminated everything. This is why God, in his greatness, castrated the male Leviathan and killed the female, salting her and preserving her for meals that the faithful partake of in heaven. [4]

It should be added, however, that God stopped playing with the Leviathan when the Temple was destroyed. [5] Since then, God has not been in a mood to play. Nor has he danced as he once did with Eve, after dressing her up and braiding her hair. [6]

Ever since the destruction of the Temple, God has been weeping, for thereby he had committed a terrible sin. [7] It weighs so heavily on his conscience that all night long he sits and bellows like a lion, crying out loud: "Woe is me, for I allowed my house to be destroyed, my temple to be burned down, and my children to be taken away!" [8]

God used to fill the entire world, but after the above-mentioned tragedy he came to fit into a tiny space four cubits wide.[9] And when someone praises him, he shakes his head and says: "Blessed is the king who is praised in his house! But how should one treat a father who let his children fall into misery?"[10]

To help the reader comprehend the scope of God's despair, let us tell a story about the lion whose bellowing God imitates. One day, this lion ran away from Eli's forest. The Roman emperor wanted to see him and asked his people to bring the beast in. When the lion was 400 miles away from the emperor, he roared with so much force that all the pregnant women miscarried and the walls of Rome crumbled. When the distance shrank to 300 miles, the lion roared again, causing everyone's canines and molars to fall out. The emperor fell down from his throne and told his people to lead the lion back home.[11]

God deeply regrets of having let the Jews fall into misery. His grief is so great that every day he drops two huge tears into the sea. The noise of these tears can be heard from one end of the world to the other, and their fall produces earthquakes.[12]

Once, the moon reproached God for making her smaller than the sun. God admitted his mistake and told others: "Offer an expiatory sacrifice for me, because I made the moon smaller than the sun."[13]

We also learn that God is not immune to flippancy and tends to act rather rashly when seized with anger.[14]

God even went so far as to take an abusive oath. Thus, he backed an act of great injustice with an oath when he angrily swore that the Israelites who lived in the desert would not have eternal life. He came to regret that oath and made sure not to keep it.[15]

Elsewhere, the Talmud informs us that whenever God takes a rash oath, someone must relieve him of it, for one rabbi once heard God exclaiming: "Woe is me! Who will relieve me of my oath?"[16] When the man reported this story to his colleagues, they treated him like a fool, because he had not thought of freeing God from the oath in question.[17]

This is why a mighty angel called Mi lives between heaven and earth, his task being to free and absolve God from any oath or vow whenever necessary.[18]

In addition to taking rash oaths, God also happened to lie in order to restore the harmony between Abraham and Sara. Therefore, adds the Talmud, it is allowed to lie for the purpose of having peace.[19]

God is also the cause of every single sin committed on the earth, because it was him who created the bad human nature.[20] It was him who predestined man to sin.[21] It was him who forced the Israelites into accepting the law.[22]

This way, argues the Talmud, we cannot really blame David for his adultery[23] or Eli's children for their excesses.[24] God alone is responsible and guilty for those wrongdoings.

NOTES

- [1] Tr. Avodah Zarah, f. 3, 2.
- [2] On the Pentateuch, f. 97, 3, p. 17; also, Targum on Canticle 5:10.
- [3] Tr. Gittin, f. 68, 1.
- [4] Tr. Avodah Zarah, f. 3; Baba Batra, f. 74, 1 and 2.
- [5] Tr. Baba Batra, f. 74, 1 and 2.
- [6] Tr. Berakhot, f. 61, 1.
- [7] Tr. Chagigah, f. 5, 2.
- [8] Tr. Berakhot, f. 3, 1.
- [9] Ibid., f. 11, 1.
- [10] Ibid.
- [11] Tr. Chullin, f. 59, 2.
- [12] Tr. Berakhot, f. 59, 1; Chagigah, f. 5, 2.
- [13] Tr. Chullin, f. 60, 2; Shevuot, f. 9, 1.
- [14] Tr. Avodah Zarah, f. 2, 2.
- [15] Tr. Sanhedrin, f. 110, 2.
- [16] Tr. Baba Batra, f. 74, 1.
- [17] Ibid.
- [18] Megaleh Amukot, f. 1, 4.
- [19] Tr. Baba Metzia, f. 87, 1.
- [20] Tr. Berakhot, f. 32, 1 and 61, 1.
- [21] Tr. Avodah Zarah, f. 4, 2.
- [22] Tr. Avodah Zarah, f. 2, 2; Shevuot, f. 88, 1.
- [23] Tr. Shevuot, f. 56, 1.
- [24] Ibid., f. 55, 2.

CHAPTER 2

ANGELS

The origin of angels. – Their functions. – Their envy towards Jews.

Some of the angels are supposed to live for all eternity, and they are those who were created on the second day. Others have a limited life-span, and they were created on the fifth day.[1]

Even today, new legions of angels are continuously born out of a huge torrent of fire. They sing in praise of God, and each of them, says the Talmud, disappears after finishing his song.[2]

One day, God destroyed an entire crowd of angels at one go, by burning them with his little finger.[3] With every word uttered by God a new angel is created.[4] As we can see, angels come to life and die with the same ease.

As to their functions, 21,000 angels are assigned to herbs, because there are 21,000 kinds of herbs on the earth.[5]

Yurkemo is the angel of hail, Michael is the prince of waters, and Gabriel is the prince of fire and fruit ripening.[6]

Similarly, good and bad love, favor and charity, fruits [sic; fear] and peace, birds and fish, winds, wild animals, medicines, the sun, the moon, the stars and so on have their own angels, and the rabbis know the name of each of them.[7]

According to the “Eagle of the Synagogue”, good angels are the souls of celestial bodies, which means that those bodies have the ability to recognize and understand things.[8]

The main task of angels during the night is to make people sleep.[9] The rest of the time they pray for those very people, who must invoke them. However, angels do not understand Syrian and Chaldean, so one should not make requests to them in either of these languages.[10]

The good thing about this angelic ignorance is that the Jews have an excellent prayer, which they recite in Chaldean so that, as the Talmud says, the excellence of this prayer would not make angels envious.[11]

According to another opinion, angels actually understand all languages, but they loathe Syrian and Chaldean so much that they simply do not listen to anything said in these two.[12]

NOTES

- [1] Bechai, op. cit., par. 7, f. 37, 4; Pirke Eliezer, ch. 4, etc.
 - [2] Tr. Chagigah, f. 14, 1.
 - [3] Pesikta Rabbati, f. 35, 2 ff.
 - [4] Chagigah, op. cit.
 - [5] Megaleh Amukot, ff. 32 and 107.
 - [6] Tr. Pesachim, f. 118; Sanhedrin, f. 95 (Rashi); Ammude ha-Shibah, f. 49.
 - [7] Berit Menuchah, f. 37, 1.
 - [8] Maimonides, *More Nebochim*, vol. 2, 5, f. 61; Bechai on the Penta-teuch, f. 9.
 - [9] Yalkut Chadash, f. 118.
 - [10] Tr. Shabbat, f. 12, 2 and Tosafot.
 - [11] Tr. Berakhot, f. 3, 1, Tosafot.
 - [12] Yalkut Chadash, f. 117, 3.
-

CHAPTER 3

DEMONS

The origin of demons. – Relations between Adam and female demons. – Relations between Eve and male demons. – The principal demons. – The role of demons and their stay on the earth. – Nut trees, bull horns, burials, etc. – The Talmud and magic.

God created demons on the Friday evening during the twilight hours, and as Saturday was about to begin, he had no time to make a body and clothes for them.[1] According to another theory, the demons did not receive a body as punishment, for they had objected that man be given one.[2]

The demonic essence consists of water and fire.[3] Some demons are made from air, and others from earth. Their soul is made from a substance that can be found under the moon and is used for this purpose only.[4]

Some demons descend from Adam, who after being cursed by God refused to approach Eve so as not to have cursed children with her. It was then that two female demons came to Adam and procreated new demons from him.[5]

According to the Talmud, Adam had a 130-year affair with Lilith, one of the most illustrious female demons, and all this time he only begot spirits, demons and night ghosts.[6]

Eve, for her part, would equally give birth to demons only during the 130 years that she lived with male demons.[7]

The Talmud further tells that demons can reproduce between themselves as well. They make children in the same way that people do, eat and drink like people, and many die just like people.[8]

Four women are celebrated as the mothers of demons. Reportedly, Solomon had full power over them, called them his maidservants and made use of their services.[9]

One of those women, says the Talmud, goes out each Thursday and Saturday night at the head of 180,000 malefic demons. This woman and her daughters are the spouses of a demon named Samael.[10]

Another of the four women, Lilith, came to disobey Adam, her husband, and as punishment for that 100 of her children have been dying every day since then. She also had to promise not to kill the little

children in her power if they bore three names of angels. She howls continuously, accompanied by 480 angels of death.[11]

Yet another of the four women dances without rest and is followed by 479 evil spirits.[12]

Just like in the time of Adam, numerous new demons continue to be born today, but it would be too disgusting to elaborate on that.

Curiously, a man can kill demons in certain circumstances, for example when he prepares Passover pastries and puts a lot of effort into it.[13] On the other hand, Noah saved a lot of mortal demons by bringing them to his ark.[14]

As to the whereabouts of demons, here is what the rabbis tell: Some demons live in the air and weave people's dreams. Others live in the ocean depths, and they would destroy the world if they were set free. Still others live in Jews, being actually responsible for Jewish sins.[15]

According to the Talmud, demons are fond of dancing between the horns of a bull that comes out of water,[16] as well as in the midst of women who return from a burial.[17] Also, demons seek the company of rabbis, because a dried-up land, says the Talmud, craves for rain.[18] In addition, they can be found on nut trees, and it is dangerous to sleep under these trees, because there is a demon on every leaf.[19]

Two famous demons, Asa and Asael, live in gloomy eastern mountains. It is from them that Balaam, Job and Jethro learned the art of magic. Equally, it is thanks to them that Solomon ruled over the birds and the rest of the demons, and it is with their help that he made the queen of Sheba pay him a visit.[20]

Because of demons, nobody should go to secluded places. Nobody should stay alone during the waxing or waning moon. Nobody should greet a person at night, because that person could be a demon. Nobody should forget to wash his or her hands early in the morning, because the unclean spirit rests on dirty hands. The list of delirious superstitions of Talmudic scholars could go on forever.

We actually have entire books dealing with superstitions and magical practices mentioned in Jewish writings. "The Talmud," says Eliphas Lévi, a French Jewish professor of magic, "is a fundamental book on magic." [21][22]

Let us tell what some of the most famous Talmudic sorcerers could do, if we were to believe the Talmud.

One of the founders of Talmudic Judaism had the supernatural power to create a person after killing someone else.[23] Each evening, with the help of another rabbi, he would create a three-year-old calf, and the two men would eat the animal together.[24]

Another Talmudic rabbi had the ability to turn pumpkins and

melons into deer and roes at will.[25] Rabbi Eliezer could cast a spell on a field and cover it with pumpkins.[26] Rabbi Yannai could turn water into scorpions; one day, he turned a woman into a donkey and rode to a marketplace on its back.[27]

Abraham, the biblical patriarch, also practiced magic and initiated others into it, we are being assured.[28] He wore a precious stone on his neck that could restore health to any sick person.[29]

The Talmudic rabbis, too, had a precious stone with which they brought the dead back to life. One day, tells the Talmud, a rabbi removed the head of a snake at a stroke and then resurrected the snake by touching it with his stone. Dried-up and salted birds that were touched with the same stone equally returned to life and merrily flew away.[30]

NOTES

- [1] Yalkut Chadash, f. 107, No. 27.
- [2] Ibid., ff. 115–116.
- [3] Nishmat Chaim, f. 117, 2.
- [4] Tub ha-Arez, f. 9, 2.
- [5] Yalkut Reubeni, No. 3.
- [6] Tr. Erubin, f. 18, 2.
- [7] Bechai, par. 1, f. 16, 1; Nishmat Chaim, f. 114, 2.
- [8] Tr. Chagigah, f. 16, 1.
- [9] Menachem, op. cit., f. 33, 3 [and other rabbis].
- [10] Tr. Pesachim, f. 112, 2.
- [11] Sefer ben Sira, f. 9, 1 and 2; Emek ha-Melech, f. 84, 2.
- [12] Yalkut Chadash, f. 108, 3.
- [13] Hanhag., f. 16.
- [14] Nishmat Chaim, f. 115, 3.
- [15] Bechai, [op. cit., p. 17], f. 90, 1.
- [16] Tr. Pesachim, f. 112, 2.
- [17] Yoreh Deah, No. 348 ff.
- [18] Tr. Berakhot, f. 6, 1.
- [19] Yalkut Chadash, f. 108, 2.
- [20] Emek ha-Melech, f. 68, 1 and f. 132, 1.
- [21] Eliphaz Lévi, *Histoire de la Magie*, Paris, 1860, p. 46.
- [22] JRBooksOnline: Lévi actually speaks about *Sefer Yetzirah*, calling it “a fundamental book of the Kabbalah”.
- [23] Tr. Sanhedrin, f. 65, 2; tr. Megillah, f. 7, 2.
- [24] Tr. Sanhedrin, op. cit.
- [25] Jerusalem Talmud, Sanhedrin, ch. 7.
- [26] Tr. Sanhedrin, f. 68, 1.
- [27] Tr. Sanhedrin, f. 67, 2; tr. Soferim, f. 13.

[28] Tr. Sanhedrin, f. 91, 1.

[29] Tr. Baba Batra, f. 16, 2.

[30] Ibid., f. 74, 2.

CHAPTER 4

MYSTERIES

How Adam and Eve were created. – Og, king of Bashan. – Og's height and his encounter with ants. – The death of Og. – What Abraham did with Og's tooth.

In 1842, in a speech made during the celebration of the Jewish year, a rabbi from Lyon named Fabius claimed that the Jewish religion was greatly superior to Christianity, as well as to any other religion, due to its lack of mysteries. Judaism, argued Fabius, was all about common sense and light, while Christianity was telling the mind to be silent and madness to speak.[1]

Well, we could already see how much "common sense and light" is exuded by the Talmud, but that is not even half of it.

Let us start with Adam. After collecting all the dust from the world, God made a pile out of it, which then became a man. However, it was a double man at first, a two-faced one, so God cut him in half. This is how Adam and Eve came into being.[2]

Adam was so big that his head touched the firmament. When he lay down, his head reached the world's edge in the east, while his legs bumped into the western edge.[3] God made a window for him, through which he could view the entire world.[4] But after Adam sinned, God shrank him to the size of an ordinary man.[5]

The next story is that of Og, the [Amorite] king of Bashan mentioned in the Bible. He received his name after meeting Abraham when the latter was baking Passover pastries, called *ugga* in Hebrew.[6]

We are informed that during the great flood Og and a rhinoceros managed to survive by staying close to Noah's ark: the water remained cold around the ark, while everywhere else the water was boiling hot.[7]

Og's daily menu consisted of 2,000 oxen, just as much game, and 1,000 baths of drink.[8]

When Israel laid siege to Bashan, Og learned that the Israelite camp stretched for three miles. Accordingly, he uprooted a huge rock three miles wide, put it on his head and set off. However, God flooded the rock with ants. They dug a big hole inside so that Og's head slipped through it and the rock hung around his neck like a necklace, while his

teeth lengthened and grew into the rock. As a result, he could not throw the rock off. Moses seized the moment, came running to Og with an ax 10 cubits long, jumped 10 cubits high and killed Og by hitting him on the ankle.[9]

This outcome, however, does not prevent the Talmud from telling that Og entered heaven alive.[10]

Elsewhere, the Talmud tells that one day Rabbi Yochanan came upon the shinbone of a dead person, walked three miles alongside it, but still failed to reach its end. The shinbone belonged to Og.[11]

The Talmud also informs us that Abraham ate and drank as much as 74 men, which, naturally, made him as strong as 74 men taken together.[12]

Still, Abraham was a weakling compared to Og, for the latter once lost a tooth and Abraham made a bed from it. As a matter of fact, the rabbis cannot agree whether Abraham used this tooth as a bed or as a chair.[13]

It has to be admitted that Christians do not have mysteries of this kind, be it in literal or allegorical form, even though the Christian religion was equally born in the Orient.

NOTES

[1] Auguste Fabius, *Offrande au Dieu de l'univers*, Lyon, 1842.

[2] Tr. Sanhedrin, f. 38, 1 and 2; Berakhot, f. 61, 1; Erubin, f. 18, 1.

[3] Tr. Sanhedrin, f. 38, 2.

[4] Tr. Chagigah, f. 12, 1.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Tr. Niddah, f. 61, 1. Tosafot.

[7] Tr. Zevachim, f. 113, 2.

[8] Tr. Soferim, f. 14, [4].

[9] Tr. Berakhot, f. 54, 2.

[10] Tr. Derech Erez, f. 20, 3.

[11] Tr. Niddah, f. 24, 2.

[12] Tr. Soferim, op. cit.

[13] Ibid.

CHAPTER 5

JEWISH AND CHRISTIAN SOULS

The origin of souls. – Difference between Jewish and non-Jewish souls. – The transmigration of souls and why it takes place.

All human souls that will exist until the end of the world were created during the six days of the Creation.[1] God then brought them into the heavenly storehouse.[2] According to all Jewish sages, God lets a soul leave the storehouse each time a mother is about to give birth to a child on the earth.[3]

Also according to all Jewish scholars, God created 600,000 Jewish souls, the reason being that every biblical verse has 600,000 interpretations, each of them related to a soul.[4]

Jewish souls have the privilege of being part of God himself; they are of one substance with God, just like a son is of one substance with his father.[5] This is why one single Jewish soul is more precious and pleasing to God than all the souls of the other nations on the earth; the latter souls come from the devil[6] and are similar to those of cattle and wild animals.[7] For this very reason the Talmud also says that the semen of a foreigner, of a non-Jew, is nothing but cattle semen.[8]

In addition to the main soul, every Jew receives a second one on Shabbat.[9] This second soul increases the desire to eat and drink.[10]

After death, Jewish souls enter other bodies. When a forebear draws his or her last breath, his or her soul animates the body of the child who is carried in the womb of a mother of a younger generation.[11]

Cain had three souls: one soul passed into the body of Jethro, another passed into Korah, and the third entered the Egyptian killed by Moses.[12]

Japheth's soul passed into Samson, that of Terah into Job, that of Eve into Isaac, that of Rahab into Eber, that of Jael into Eli, and that of Esau, if we were to believe Abarbanel, passed into Jesus.[13] Now, according to the Talmud, Esau was a murderer and an adulterer.[14]

As to impious Jews, like those who abandoned the Jewish faith or killed a fellow Jew, they pass into animals or plants after their death. Following that, they have to spend 12 months in hell as punishment, after which they are created anew and successively pass into unanimated objects, animals, pagans, and finally into Jews.[15]

This transmigration of souls is an act of charity on the part of God, who wants every single Jew to have eternal life.[16]

NOTES

- [1] Nishmat Chaim, f. 70, 2.
- [2] Rashi on the tr. Chagigah, f. 5, 1.
- [3] Nishmat Chaim, f. 72, 1.
- [4] Yalkut Chadash, f. 155, 1.
- [5] Shefa Tal, f. 4; Shenei Luchot ha-Berit, f. 262, 3; other rabbis.
- [6] Shefa Tal, f. 4, 2; Menachem, par. 53, f. 221, 4.
- [7] Yalkut Chadash, f. 154, 2.
- [8] Tr. Yevamot, f. 94, 2, Tosafot.
- [9] Tr. Taanit, f. 27, 2.
- [10] Rashi on Taanit, op. cit.
- [11] Nishmat Chaim, f. 159, 2.
- [12] Yalkut Reubeni, No. 9, Gilg.
- [13] Yalkut Reubeni, No. 18, 24, 61, 1; Yalkut Chadash, f. 127, 3; Abarbanel, commentary on Isaiah, f. 54, 3.
- [14] Tr. Baba Batra, f. 16, 2.
- [15] Sefer Emek ha-Melech, f. 16, 1 [2?].
- [16] Sefer Avodat ha-Kodesh, II, 48, 2; Nishmat Chaim, f. 163, 2.

CHAPTER 6

HEAVEN AND HELL

Heaven is for Jews only. – What they serve in heaven. – Hell is for the other nations.

Heaven, says the Talmud, is imbued with a highly pleasant fragrance. One day, Elijah scattered the leaves of heavenly trees over the robe of a Talmudic rabbi, and when the rabbi put his robe back on, it smelled so sweet that he was able to sell it for [12,000 denarii].[1]

In heaven, as we already know, the faithful eat the salted meat of the female Leviathan. They are also treated with the flesh of a wild ox, which is so huge that every day he grazes in the pastures of 100 mountains.[2] Next, they eat a huge and very delicious bird, while the fourth meal consists of incredibly fat geese.[3]

The drink served in heaven is an exquisite and very old vintage wine, made on the sixth day of the Creation.[4]

Sure enough, it is only the faithful – that is, the Jews – who go to heaven. The godless ones end up in hell.[5]

Hell is a place where there is nothing but dirt and rot, nothing but tears and darkness. Every dwelling in hell has 6,000 crates, each of them containing 6,000 barrels filled with gall.[6]

Curiously, hell is 60 times larger than heaven,[7] because hell must take in all those who are not circumcised, such as Christians, who move their fingers back and forth (i.e., make the sign of a cross), or Muslims, who only wash their hands and feet, but not their hearts; all of them will go to hell[8] and will stay there forever.[9]

NOTES

[1] Tr. Baba Metzia, f. 114, 2.

[2] Tr. Baba Batra, f. 74, 2.

[3] Ibid., f. 73, 2.

[4] Tr. Sanhedrin, f. 99, 1.

[5] Tr. Chagigah, f. 15, 1; Erubin, f. 19, 1.

[6] Reshit Chochmah, f. 37, 2.

[7] Tr. Taanit, f. 10, 1.

[8] Zeror ha-Mor, par. Told. Yizch., f. 27, 2, and many other places.

[9] Tr. Rosh Hashanah, f. 17, 1, and many other places.

CHAPTER 7

THE MESSIAH AND HIS REIGN

The Jews ardently wait for the Messiah. – What the Messiah will give to the Jews. – The fate of the other nations. – Who the real Messiah is.

The Jews keep waiting for the Messiah, and their most ardent wish is to witness the establishment of his reign. Let us see, then, what the Jews expect from the Messiah and the messianic reign.

When the Messiah arrives, says the Talmud, the earth will produce cakes, woolen clothes and wheat with grains as large as the kidneys of the mightiest oxen.[1]

The Messiah will make the Jews the rulers of the world, all the nations will serve him, and all the kingdoms will become his subjects.[2] Every Jew will have 2,800 slaves and 310 worlds.[3]

However, the Messiah will not come as long as the miserable and despicable reign of the other nations lasts.[4] Therefore, the rulers of all the foreign nations must be overthrown and those nations must come under Jewish rule.[5]

Wherever the Jews come to live, they must become the rulers of their masters.[6] Until this ultimate goal is achieved, the Jews will consider themselves exiles and prisoners. As long as the Jews living in foreign cities are not the masters there, they must exclaim: "Desolation! Misery!"[7] The captivity of Israel will last until the foreign rulers are all exterminated.[8]

But before the foreign rulers are exterminated and their nations enslaved, before the Jews become the masters in foreign cities, before the messianic reign begins, a long and brutal war will break out. Two-thirds of the other nations will perish, and it will take the Jews seven years to burn the captured weapons.[9] The old enemies of Israel will then see their teeth grow out of their mouths to a distance of 22 cubits.[10]

While waiting for that to happen, the Jews will live in a state of permanent war against all the foreign nations.[11]

Following the final victory, the Messiah will accept the gifts of all the nations save for those of Christians.[12]

The Jews will become immensely rich, for they will get hold of all the riches of the other nations. These riches will be stored in a treasure

house so big that 300 donkeys will be needed to carry the keys to its doors and locks.[13]

All the nations will embrace the Jewish faith. Christians, however, will not enjoy this grace and will be exterminated,[14] for they come from the devil.[15]

Only then will the expectations of the Jewish nation be fulfilled, because the Messiah they await so much, preparing his coming with all their might, is actually the Jewish nation itself, and its reign over all the nations of the earth will mean that the Messiah has finally arrived.

Today, just like in the Savior's time, the messianic reign is denatured by earthly fantasies, and the true Messiah is disparaged in a manner that fills every good Christian with indignation. Is it not outrageous that the Jews living in Christian countries are allowed to openly insult Jesus Christ, depicting him as an idol born out of debauchery and adultery?[16]

NOTES

[1] Tr. Ketubot, f. 111, 2; tr. Shabbat, f. 30, 2.

[2] Tr. Shabbat, f. 120, 1; tr. Sanhedrin, f. 88, 2 and f. 99, 1.

[3] Yalkut Shimoni, f. 56, 4; Bechai, op. cit., f. 168, etc.

[4] *Die Polemik*, p. 19.

[5] Ibid.

[6] Ibid., p. 18.

[7] Ibid., pp. 18–19.

[8] *Prof. Dr. Rohling*, pp. 80, 8.

[9] Abarbanel, *Mashmiah Jeshua*, f. 74, 4 and f. 76, 1. See also Maimonides on the tr. Shabbat, op. cit.

[10] Akiba, *Othioth*.

[11] *Die Polemik*, p. 19.

[12] Tr. Pesachim, f. 118, 2, and many other rabbis.

[13] Tr. Pesachim, f. 119; tr. Sanhedrin, f. 110, 2, etc.

[14] Tr. Yevamot, f. 24, 2; tr. Avodah Zarah, f. 3, 2, etc.

[15] Zeror ha-Mor, f. 125, 2.

[16] Auguste Fabius, *Offrande au Dieu de l'univers*, from the Talmud (Amsterdam and Venice eds.), tr. Sanhedrin, ff. 67 and 107, etc.

PART THREE

CORRUPTION OF MORALS

CHAPTER 1

NEIGHBOR

All non-Jews are animals in human form: dogs, donkeys, pigs, etc. – The Jew's neighbor is the Jew only. – The other nations must be despised, but without showing it. – Hypocrisy is allowed.

—The Jews, claims the Talmud, are more pleasing to God than angels.[1] It also says that one who slaps a Jew is just as guilty as if he slapped a divine being.[2] The rabbis, as we have already seen, confirm this latter statement by saying that the Jews are of one substance with God, just like a son is of one substance with his father. Therefore, a goy (i.e., a pagan, a non-Jew) who slaps a Jew deserves death.[3]

According to the Talmud, if there were no Jews, there would be no blessing on the earth,[4] no rain and no sun.[5] For this reason, the nations of the earth simply cannot survive without the Jews.[6]

“There is a difference between all things... and just like men are superior to animals, so are the Jews superior to all the nations of the earth.”[7] The Talmud even goes so far as to say that the foreigner's semen is just like the semen of cattle.[8]

Now, according to Rabbi Kroner, a foreigner (Nochri) and a non-Jew is one and the same thing.[9] The Talmud, for its part, says that a foreigner is one who is not circumcised, and that a foreigner and a pagan is one and the same thing.[10]

The Talmud also says that “the graves of non-Jews do not soil Israel, because the Jews alone are humans, while the other nations are a variety of animals”.[11]

According to the Talmud, “dog” is just another word for a non-Jew. Thus, a commentary on Exodus 12:16 says that the holy feasts are for Israel and not for foreigners or dogs.[12] Rabbi Moshe ben Nachman is of the same opinion, pointing out that those feasts were established “for

you rather than for goyim; for you rather than for dogs".[13] In his commentaries on the Pentateuch, Rashi says exactly the same with regard to the above-mentioned passage from Exodus. Curiously, the words "rather than for dogs" only appear in the Venice edition, while in that of Amsterdam they were prudently left out.

Elsewhere, it is stated that non-Jews are actually inferior to dogs, because "during a feast one can prepare food for dogs, but not for non-Jews; one must keep dogs alive but not non-Jews".[14] Or: "It is not allowed to give meat to non-Jews; it is better to throw it to dogs, because they are superior to non-Jews".[15]

Non-Jews are also called donkeys.[16] Abarbanel says: "The chosen people are worthy of eternal life, while the other nations are like donkeys."[17]

" 'Donkey' is another word for a non-Jew."[18]

"The children of non-Jews or slaves have no family ties with their parents, because they are like donkeys."[19]

"The houses of the goyim are like dwellings of animals,"[20] so when Nebuchadnezzar offered his daughter to Ben Sira, the latter responded: "I am a human being and not an animal."[21]

Rabbi Menachem says: "You Israelites are humans, but the other nations are not, because their souls come from the unclean spirit, while the souls of Israel come from the holy spirit of God."[22]

Yalkut writes along the same lines: the Israelites are called humans, while idolaters (which also includes Christians, because they worship "an idol") are called pigs, since they come from the unclean spirit.[23]

Edels, the famous rabbi, is of the same opinion: according to him, the psalmist equates non-Jews to "unclean pigs living in forests".[24]

Similarly, "a woman that has just taken a bath must bathe again if the first thing she sees is an unclean object, such as a dog, a donkey, a lunatic, a non-Jew, a camel, a pig, a horse or a leper".[25]

In a word, all non-Jews are animals, be it dogs, donkeys or pigs.

The semen of a non-Jew is the same as the semen of an animal.[26] Equally, if we were to listen to Abarbanel, a foreign woman who is not a daughter of Israel is an animal.[27]

The fact that non-Jews received a human form is merely a display of God's tactfulness towards the Jews: "God created non-Jews in human form out of respect for Jews, because the task of non-Jews is to serve the Jews day and night with no respite, and it is not appropriate for a prince to be served by an animal in its animal form; rather, it should be done by an animal in human form."[28]

Therefore, "when a Christian servant of a Jew dies, other Jews should not express their condolences as if it was a human death; rather, they should behave as if it was an animal who died".[29]

For this very reason, “a Jew is forbidden to praise the knowledge or virtue of a Christian, unless he does it with the same attitude as if he praised the physical force or beauty of an animal, to whom a non-Jew is identical”. [30]

True to this practice, Rabbi Nathansohn, who died [in 1875] in Lemberg and who is greatly venerated in Judaism, gave the following advice, which would be funny if the above-quoted texts did not give away its true meaning: “It is not wise to go to the theater when ballet is performed, because that could lead to *two sins*: first, the dancers’ clothes could cause voluptuousness, and secondly, their beauty could drive one to praise them, which is forbidden if they are not Jews.” [31]

Based on these principles, all those who are not Jews, and particularly those who abandoned Judaism – such as Jesus Christ, who, according to the Talmud, fell into idolatry and seduced many others into it [32] – must not be treated as neighbors by Jews.

One does not love an animal like one does a neighbor. A man who persists in his sins must be punished. In the eyes of the Jews, a pagan who does not become a Jew, as well as a Christian who remains faithful to Jesus Christ, is an enemy of God and that of Jews.

— Accordingly, the Talmud claims that the words “God is not angry” (Isaiah 27:4) refer to the Jews, while the words “God vents his wrath” (Nahum 1:2) refer to the other nations of the earth. [33]

The name of Sinai, says the Talmud, means that [God’s] wrath descended upon the nations of the earth. [34] Therefore, the words “do not show charity towards them” supposedly refer to those nations. [35] In addition, “it is forbidden to have compassion for a man who lacks reason”. [36]

Rabbi Gershon says the same: “A pious man should not take pity on a villain.” [37] So does Abarbanel: “A man should not show mercy to his enemies.” [38]

According to the Talmud, the faithful ones (God’s friends and relatives) are allowed to deceive all those who are impious, for it is written: “Be pure with those who are pure, and perverted with those who are perverted.” [39]

“Just like a Moor is different from the other creatures,” adds Rabbi Eliezer, “so is Israel different from the other nations of the earth due to its good works.” [40]

Therefore, says the Talmud, it is forbidden to greet the impious. [41]

Now, the following precept is truly something: “One must always be cunning out of fear for God.” [42]

For this reason, one can greet a foreigner (a non-Jew) as well, but solely for the sake of peace, so as to be well received and avoid trouble. [43]

Hypocrisy, says Bechai, is allowed in the sense that a man (i.e., a Jew) can be polite and respectful to an impious person (i.e., to a non-Jew) and tell him: "I love you." This is allowed, says Bechai, if a man (i.e., a Jew) considers it necessary to do so and has reasons to be afraid; otherwise, this would be a sin.[44]

Indeed, the Talmud does teach that it is allowed to be hypocritical towards those who are impious.[45]

Now, impious persons are those who belong to the other nations of the earth, those who are not Jews. Any good they do, any alms they give, any charity they show – any of that, says the Talmud, is considered a sin, because they do it to glorify themselves.[46] This is quite natural, since all those who are not circumcised are pagans, villains and godless people, if we were to believe the Talmud.[47] Muslims, too, fall into this category despite their circumcision, because it is not a proper one.[48]

This is why a Jew who meets a goy can greet him by saying: "God help you!" or "God bless your work!" In his heart, however, the Jew must say that the God of Christians can do nothing, thereby mocking at the Christian with his greeting.[49]

Also, this is why a Jew can do good to Christians, treat their sick or bury their dead, but only for the sake of peace, so as to not draw their anger.[50]

Finally, this is why Rabbi Kahana, in accordance with the said precept, would normally greet a goy with the words: "May peace be with you!" However, he addressed this wish to his teacher rather than to the goy.[51]

NOTES

[1] Tr. Chullin, f. 91, 2.

[2] Tr. Sanhedrin, f. 58, 2.

[3] Ibid.

[4] Tr. Yevamot, f. 63, 1.

[5] Bechai on the Pentateuch, par. 34, f. 153, 3.

[6] Zeror ha-Mor, f. 107, 2.

[7] Ibid., f. 101, 2.

[8] Tr. Yevamot, f. 94, 2; Tosafot [to Ketubot, f. 3, 2].

[9] Cf. Kroner's response, 1, 47.

[10] Tr. Berakhot, f. 47, 2; tr. Gittin, f. 70, 1; tr. Avodah Zarah, f. 26, 2, Tosafot.

[11] Tr. Baba Metzia, f. 114, 2.

[12] Tr. Megillah, f. 7, 2.

- [13] Fol. 50, 4, par. Bo.
 - [14] *Prof. Dr. Rohling*, p. 60.
 - [15] *Ibid.*
 - [16] Tr. Berakhot, 25, 2.
 - [17] Commentary on Hos. 4, f. 230, 4.
 - [18] *Die Polemik*, p. 11.
 - [19] *Prof. Dr. Rohling*, p. 72.
 - [20] Leb Tob, f. 46, 1.
 - [21] Ben Sira, f. 8, 2.
 - [22] *Ibid.*, f. 14, 1, par. 1.
 - [23] Yalkut Reubeni, f. 10, 2.
 - [24] *Die Polemik*, p. 10.
 - [25] Ch. Radenhausen, *Esther: Die Semitische Unmoral*, pp. 13, X.
 - [26] *Die Polemik*, p. 10.
 - [27] Mark. Hamish, par. Tavo. [Commentary on Deuteronomy.]
 - [28] *Die Polemik*, p. 12.
 - [29] *Prof. Dr. Rohling*, p. 64.
 - [30] *Ibid.*, p. 63.
 - [31] *Ibid.*
 - [32] Avodah Zarah, f. 26, 2.
-
- [33] *Ibid.*, f. 4, 1.
 - [34] Tr. Shabbat, f. 89, 1.
 - [35] Tr. Yevamot, f. 123, 1.
 - [36] Tr. Sanhedrin, f. 92, 1.
 - [37] Commentary on 1 Kings 18:14.
 - [38] Mark. Hamish, f. 77, 4. [*Mashmiah Jeshua*, op. cit.]
 - [39] Tr. Baba Batra, f. 123, 1; tr. Megillah, f. 13, 2.
 - [40] Pirke, ch. 53.
 - [41] Tr. Gittin, f. 62, 1.
 - [42] Tr. Berakhot, f. 17, 1.
 - [43] *Ibid.*; tr. Gittin, f. 61, 1.
 - [44] Kad ha-Kemach, f. 30, 1.
 - [45] Tr. Sota, f. 41, 2.
 - [46] Tr. Baba Batra, f. 10, 2.
 - [47] Tr. Nedarim, f. 31, 2; Pesachim, f. 92, 1.
 - [48] Tr. Avodah Zarah, f. 27, 1, Tosafot.
 - [49] *Prof. Dr. Rohling*, pp. 71, 5.
 - [50] Tr. Gittin, f. 61, 1.
 - [51] *Meine Antworten*, p. 27.

CHAPTER 2

PROPERTY AND WORLD SUPREMACY

God has given the Earth to the Jews. – Accordingly, the Jews are entitled to steal from the goyim. – How this principle is put into practice.

Given that Israel and the divine majesty is one and the same thing, if we were to believe the Talmud, it is only natural that the entire world lawfully belongs to the Jews.

Accordingly, the Talmud openly says: "If an ox belonging to a Jew wounds a foreigner's ox, the Jew does not have to pay anything, but if a foreigner's ox wounds an ox belonging to a Jew, the foreigner must pay all the damage, for it is written in the Scripture: God stood, measured the earth and gave the goyim to the Jews. The children of Noah did not follow the seven commandments that God had given to them, so he stood and gave their property to the Jews." [1]

Now, the children of Noah are none other than the nations of the earth as opposed to the children of Abraham, who are the Jews. [2] This is why Rabbi Albo, in harmony with other rabbis, says: "God has given the Jews power over the property and life of all the nations." [3]

The Talmud says in no uncertain terms: "A child of Noah who stole as little as a dime must be put to death". [4] Or: "A child of Noah must not steal." Therefore, even if the child of Noah diligently followed the seven commandments of Noah and was like a high priest, [5] the best way to prevent him from stealing would still be to kill him. [6]

An Israelite, on the contrary, is fully entitled to do harm to a non-Jew, because, as the Talmud claims, it is written: "Do not harm your neighbor" and not: "Do not harm a non-Jew." [7]

The Talmud further says: "Stealing from a goy is allowed." [8]

Another precept worthy of mention is this: "Do not oppress your hired servant if he is one of your brethren; all the others can be oppressed." [9]

Rabbi Ashi showed how these precepts should be put into practice. One day, says the Talmud, he saw a vine heavy with grapes and told his servant: "Bring me some grapes if this wine is owned by a foreigner, but if it belongs to a Jew, do not touch it." [10]

The commandment "do not steal", if we were to listen to Maimonides, the "Eagle of the Synagogue", means that one should not steal

from a human being, that is, a Jew.[11] Elsewhere, Maimonides openly says that stealing from a non-Jew is allowed.[12]

All these teachings fully agree with the fundamental principle that the entire world belongs to the Jews, which means that they cannot steal by definition. Therefore, when a Talmudic rabbi says that stealing is a sin, he thinks to himself: "The Jew simply cannot steal; all he does is take back what rightfully belongs to him." Sure enough, this should only be done when the circumstances allow it, when the Jew is the master. A rabbi could even say that it is forbidden to steal both from a Jew and a goy, but he would still add to himself: "Provided that there is such a thing as stealing from a goy."

Another reason is this: "The goy's money is an object with no owner, so any Jew is entitled to come into its possession." [13]

The above principles make us understand the true consequences of the documents collected by Kalikst de Wolski in *La Russie Juive*. [14] They show how the Jewish authorities sell individual Jews the right to dispose of the property of various Christians, allowing these Jews to use all possible means to seize the property in question and at the same time forbidding any other Jew to claim it. This way, an object that has so far belonged to the Jewish nation in a purely declarative way becomes the private property of a certain Jew after the respective document is issued. The new "owner" can now do whatever is necessary to lay hands on "his" property. The Christian might still own that object physically, but he is nothing but a usurper, and this "injustice" ends once the Jew has robbed the Christian in one way or another. As to the Christian's right of ownership, it is not even discussed: this is just a temporary hindrance.

Now, even though the Christian and everything he owns are an exclusive property of the Jew who paid for the right of ownership, another Jew is sometimes allowed to intervene: "Many [documents] authorize a second Jew to enter into relations with the said goy, to conclude deals with him, to loan him money, to deceive him or put pressure on him, because the property of a goy is basically property with no owner, and anyone [that is, any Jew] has the right to seize it." [15]

In this latter case, however, the second Jew must share his profits with the first, because "when two Jews jointly participate in a deal and one of them deceives a goy, robs him or steals from him, he must give half the profit to his Jewish associate". [16]

Well, Pfefferkorn was perfectly right when he wrote: "According to the Talmud, everything owned by Christians is abandoned property, not unlike sand on the beach, so the first [Jew] to come into its possession becomes its true owner." [17]

The Talmud is truly inexhaustible on this subject. Elsewhere, it wittily says: "Israel is like a housewife to whom her husband brings money. Without having to slave away, Israel receives the money of all the nations of the earth." [18]

NOTES

[1] Tr. Baba Kamma, f. 37, 2.

[2] Tr. Megillah, f. 13, 2; Shekalim, f. 7, 1; Sota, f. 36, 2; Kad ha-Kemach, f. 56, 4; Bechai on Genesis 46:27, f. 56, 1.

[3] Sefer ha-Ikkarim, 3, ch. 25; Yalkut Shimoni on Habakkuk, f. 83, 3, No. 563.

[4] Tr. Yevamot, f. 47, 2.

[5] Sanhedrin, f. 59, 1; Avodah Zarah, f. 3, 1, Tosafot.

[6] Tr. Avodah Zarah, f. 71, 2, Tosafot.

[7] Tr. Sanhedrin, f. 57, 1, Tosafot.

[8] Tr. Baba Metzia, f. 111, 2.

[9] Ibid.

[10] Tr. Baba Kamma, f. 113, 2.

[11] Sefer ha-Mitzvot, 105, 2.

[12] Yad ha-Chazakah, 4, 9, 1; Rashi on Leviticus 19:11.

[13] *Prof. Dr. Rohling*, pp. 51, 4.

[14] Kalikst de Wolski, *La Russie Juive*, pp. 119ff.

[15] *Prof. Dr. Rohling*, p. 51.

[16] Ibid.

[17] *Dissert. philol.*, p. 11.

[18] *Die Polemik*, p. 16.

CHAPTER 3

FRAUD

How to act during a trial between a Jew and a non-Jew. – Profanation of the name of God. – How various rabbis deceived the goyim. – Shabbat gatherings.

The Talmud says: “You can deceive a goy and practice usury against him, but if you sell something to your neighbor [i.e., a Jew] or buy something from him, you must not deceive him.”[1]

Elsewhere, we read: “When a Jew has a dispute with a non-Jew [and the trial takes place in a country ruled by the Jews], you must let your brother win the case and tell the foreigner: ‘This is what our law says.’ If the foreign law is favorable to the Jew, you must also let your brother win and tell the foreigner: ‘This is what your law says.’ And if neither case applies [i.e., the country is not ruled by the Jews and the law is not on their side], various intrigues must be used to deceive the [court]” until the Jew wins the case.[2]

The above passage is followed by the “words of rabbi Ishmael”. According to them, [Rabbi] Akiba taught that in such cases one must take care not to get caught and thereby discredit the Jewish religion.[3]

Now, here is how this latter phrase is interpreted in rabbinical literature. A Jew discredits Judaism when he is caught perjuring, stealing or lying, which “profanes the holy name of God”. According to Rashi, a Jew is allowed, say, to deceive a non-Jewish customs officer provided that the name of God is not profaned – for example, if the officer does not realize that the Jew has lied when he claimed that he carried nothing [illegal] with him.[4]

Rabbi Ismael of Narbonne asks himself how perjury can possibly be justified considering that Akiba forbids one to deceive a foreigner with intrigues so as not to profane the holy name of God. The answer, according to Ismael, is that Akiba merely says that one should not get caught by a foreigner.[5]

The Talmud tells that Rabbi Samuel, one of its greatest patriarchs, was of the opinion that stealing from a goy was allowed. One day, a goy was selling a golden bottle, wrongly believing that it was made of brass. Samuel bought it for four drachmas only, and he actually gave the goy one drachma less.

Another rabbi, Kahana, bought 100 barrels of wine from a goy and made him deliver 120.

Yet another rabbi, after selling one goy a certain number of palm trunks to be cut into pieces, called his servant and told him: "Cut a bit from each trunk, as the goy only knows the number of trunks but not their exact thickness." [6]

And here is Rabbi Moses prescribing sacred prudence: "If a goy counts something and makes a mistake, the Jew must say: 'I know nothing about it.' Still, the goy should not actually be forced to make a mistake, because he could pretend he was deceived so as to test the Jew." [7]

Brenz, a former rabbi, writes: "If the Jews have spent a week deceiving Christians, they gather together on the Shabbat day, brag about the tricks they have played, and say: 'The hearts of Christians must be pulled out and the best of them must be put to death.' " [8] Sure enough, this should only be done when possible.

NOTES

[1] Tr. Baba Metzia. f. 61, 1, Tosafot; tr. Megillah, 13, 2.

[2] Tr. Baba Kamma, f. 113, 1.

[3] Ibid.

[4] *Prof. Dr. Rohling*, p. 58.

[5] Ibid., pp. 58–59.

[6] Baba Kamma, op. cit.

[7] *Sefer Mitzvot Gadol*, f. 132, 3.

[8] Samuel Friedrich Brenz, *Jüdischer abgestreifter Schlangenbalg*. Nuremberg, 1880.

CHAPTER 4

FOUND OBJECTS

It is forbidden to return lost objects to the goyim. – Reasons for this prohibition.

The Talmud says: "God will not forgive one who returns a lost object to a goy." [1] Or: "It is forbidden to return a lost object to a goy." [2]

Similarly, Rabbi Moses teaches that it is prohibited to return lost objects to heretics, idolaters and all those who openly profane Shabbat. [3]

Elsewhere, we read: "If a Jew provides information on a Jew who is on the run for failing to pay his debt to a goy, the former Jew should not be treated as a denouncer (who is put to death), because the latter Jew actually owes money, but nevertheless giving such information is an act of great impiety, and the one who does so is just as guilty as if he returned a lost object to a goy. For this reason, the Jew at fault must compensate the other Jew for all the damage suffered by the latter as a result of the information provided." [4]

Rabbi Yerucham says the same: "If a goy lends money to a Jew and then loses the receipt, the Jew who finds the receipt should not return it to the goy, because the payment obligation ceases to exist once the receipt is found by a Jew. And if the person who has found the receipt says: 'I want to return it so as to honor the holy name of God,' he or she must be told: 'If you want to honor the name of God, do it with something that belongs to you.' " [5]

Let us now recall what the rabbis understand by honoring and profaning the name of God. Profaning the name of God means to discredit the reputation of Israel by being caught perjuring, stealing, committing adultery, etc. We can easily find numerous examples of this manner of speaking. As to honoring the name of God, this means to glorify Judaism in public with all kinds of virtues: charity, humanism, philanthropy and the like.

The above precepts are justified in various ways. Rashi, for example, argues as follows: "One who returns a lost object to a goy puts him on the same level with an Israelite." [6] Maimonides, for his part, says: "One who returns a lost object to a goy commits a sin, because he increases the power of the impious". [7] Finally, if we were to listen to

the same Rashi, doing such a thing is equivalent to loving the goy in question, but “one who loves a goy hates his own creator”.[8]

NOTES

[1] Tr. Sanhedrin, f. 76, 2; tr. Baba Kamma, 113, 2.

[2] Tr. Yoma, f. 88, 4.

[3] Ibid., f. 132, 3.

[4] *Prof. Dr. Rohling*, p. 67.

[5] *Sefer Mesh.*, f. 51, 4.

[6] On the tr. Sanhedrin, op. cit.

[7] *Yad ha-Chazakah*, 4, 11, 3, f. 31, 1.

[8] *Die Polemik*, p. 20.

CHAPTER 5

USURY

Christian teaching with regard to the loan. – How the rabbis falsified the biblical law. – The rabbis acted in bad faith. – Examples of usury practiced by rabbis. – Hypocritical pretexts. – What Jewish children are taught about usury.

The law of God commands those who are wealthy to help those who are in need, either by making gifts (i.e., giving alms) or by giving loans. A loan is when you give someone a usable object to be used by him or her, under the condition that the other person [returns you this object or] gives you an object of the same nature and cost by a certain date.

It would be unfair if you asked the debtor to give you back more than the equivalent of the loan if his or her capital did not increase as a result of the loan. After all, you did not give more than what was eventually used, so you are only entitled to what you gave. Demanding something in addition would be usury.

Now, it often happens that due to the temporary loss of the loaned object the lender suffers damages, runs risks or loses profits. This situation is common for so-called *productive* objects. In such a case, unless he is supposed to give alms, the lender can claim more than a mere equivalent of the loaned object, because he gives more than the object itself. This additional claim is legitimate as long as the interest charged remains commensurate with the risk run by the lender, the damage he can suffer or the profit he loses (one related to the productivity of the loaned object). Otherwise, we deal with usury.

At a close examination, money is not a productive object, unless the temporary loss of capital causes damage to the lender.

It is obvious that a Jew would have to claim an interest proportionate to the benefit provided by him along with the loaned object, whether he dealt with his fellow Jew or a foreigner.

Now, God has the supreme right of ownership, based on which he handed Canaan over to Israel. By virtue of the same right, God allowed the ancient Israelites to claim more than the equivalent of an object loaned to foreigners, including for the mere use of the object, that is, when the lender only provided the object as such but not the benefit associated with it under the above conditions. Yes, God did allow such a

thing, but it was nothing but an anomaly, justified by the historical circumstances of the time. Besides, it is obvious that this additional claim, one permitted as an exception, had to be commensurate with the loaned object, the service provided and the foreigner's material condition. Otherwise, that would have meant exploiting the neighbor's plight.

Let us now see what rabbinism teaches in this regard.

Moses, as we have just shown, *allowed* the Jews to claim interest from non-Jews (a fair one, needless to say) for the mere use of a loaned object, when no benefit was associated with this use. He said as follows: "You *may* charge a foreigner interest." [1]

However, a whole number of "infallible" rabbis teach that Moses supposedly said this: "You *must* charge a foreigner interest."

Maimonides, the "Eagle", writes: "God *commanded* us to practice usury against the goy and to provide him a loan only if he agrees to pay interest, so that instead of helping him we would harm him, including when he is useful to us (because this way we would receive usurious interest), something that must not be done to an Israelite." [2]

"The word of Moses," echoes another rabbi, "is an order." [3]

The Talmud equally says: "Lending to the goyim without usury is forbidden, while lending with usury is allowed." [4] This teaching is repeated by Levi ben Gershon [5] and many others.

After such a distortion of the biblical text, Jewish lenders were just a breath away from raising the interest rate as much as they could, even for the mere use of the loaned object, and particularly so when a certain benefit was provided along with the object itself.

Bechai suggests that the other rabbis knew perfectly well the true meaning of Moses' words, namely that the interest charged by the lender had to be a fair one. He writes: "The rabbis of blessed memory told us that the interest charged from a foreigner should not exceed the amount necessary for [the lender's] subsistence." [6]

Still, driven as he is by a contradictory spirit and a sense of personal infallibility, the same person, while addressing a faithful Jew, says as follows about an apostate Jew in particular and a non-Jew in general: "His life belongs to you, and this is even more true of his money." [7] Obviously, this precept justifies an unrestrained rise in interest rates, as well as theft and robbery, for it leaves our lives and property at the mercy of the Jews.

The Talmud also informs us: "Samuel said that sages [rabbis] could lend at usury to each other. But how is that possible? Do we not know that usury is forbidden? Well, the fact is that usurious interest is nothing but a gift made in recognition of the loan. Samuel told ben Ihi: 'Lend me 100 pounds of pepper at a price of 120, because this is fair

[as a gift, in recognition of the service].’ According to Rav Yehudah, one rabbi said that a man [i.e., a Jew] was allowed to lend at usury to his children and household, so they could get the taste of usury.”[8]

The above passage gives us some important food for thought. To start with, it makes no mention of any legitimate interest but simply says that “usury is forbidden”. In other words, Moses forbade usury to everyone, including to rabbis. Therefore, the interest mentioned here is an illegal one, because: a) it is charged for the mere use of the loaned object (pepper) and b) the 20% interest rate is way too high.

Next, this passage describes a hypocritical and reprehensible trick performed under the pretext of making a gift. The fact is that Moses unconditionally forbade the Jews to practice usury between themselves for the mere use of an object, so it does not matter whether usury is practiced in an open or hidden manner. Moses made no exception for a hidden sin. A rather telling example of how rabbinism preserves and interprets the Bible.

Finally, we can see from there how Jewish children are accustomed to usury in a perfidious manner. Since a rabbi pays his colleague an outrageous 20% interest rate as something “loyal and fair”, we can only imagine how much zeal will be used to instill the minds of young Jews with the liking for usury, especially when dealing with foreigners. It is due to this centuries-long education that the Münster Jews, as we could recently see, lent 70 thalers to a man and made him sign a receipt for 100 thalers and pay an 8% interest rate for the *latter* amount. Nothing to be surprised about, really. Rabbi Kroner brushes incidents of this kind aside by saying that the ideas of today’s statesmen with regard to interest greatly differ from ours. Apparently, this allows him to consider such things to be perfectly innocent.

Abarbanel, for his part, does not hide the fact that the Jews interpret the law in the sense that the interest rate can be raised at will, but he tries to whitewash his brethren by adding this detail: “Christians are not to be included in the category of foreigners against whom we can practice usury, for they are not foreigners in the eyes of our Heavenly Father.” Still, the same great Abarbanel (a minister of finances in Spain at one time) explains that if he said that Christians were not to be considered foreigners, he only did it for the sake of peace, so that the Jews could live among Christians without trouble.[9] As we can see, Abarbanel mastered the science of hypocrisy extremely well.

Another rabbi openly says: “Our sages were right when they allowed the Israelites to practice usury against the goyim, that is, Christians.”[10]

All this being said, we cannot help but fully agree with Dietrich

Schwab, a converted rabbi, who wrote as follows: "The Jew excels at deceiving a Christian who needs money. He keeps piling interest upon interest until the Christian can no longer pay the debt without selling his belongings or until the amount due to the Jew reaches a sum as high as the total value of the Christian's property. When the latter happens, the Jew promptly goes to court and comes into possession of the Christian's property with the aid of judges." [11]

NOTES

- [1] Deuteronomy 23:20.
- [2] Sefer Mitzvot, f. 73, 4.
- [3] Pesikta Rabbati, f. 80, 3, par. Teze.
- [4] Tr. Avodah Zarah. f. 77, 1, Piskei Tosafot, 1.
- [5] On the Pentateuch, f. 234, 1, Teze.
- [6] Ibid., f. 213, 4, Teze.
- [7] Ibid., f. 214, 1.
- [8] Tr. Baba Metzia. f. 75, 1.
- [9] Mark. Hamish, f. 77, 4, Teze.
- [10] Magen Abraham, ch. 72.
- [11] Dietrich Schwab, *Jüdischer Deckmantel*, p. 171.

CHAPTER 6

MURDER

The murder of a non-Jew is allowed. – Non-Jews must be killed whenever possible. – What to do with a goy who falls into a pit. – These rules apply to Christians and all the pagans. – Historical facts from Jewish books.

It is taught that if a Jewish priest kills a man, he is no longer allowed to give a priestly blessing (by raising his hands), even if the murder was unpremeditated and even if the priest has repented for it. Talmudic commentators justify this prohibition by saying that it is improper to bless with a hand that killed a man. However, in *Shaarei Tshuva* we read that the blessing can be given if the murdered person was a goy, including when the murder was premeditated. Therefore, the murder of a non-Jew is *not* considered a sin. In what follows, we will see that this is actually a good deed, one pleasing to God.[1]

It is written: “The flesh of the other nations of the earth is like that of donkeys, and their semen is like that of cattle, while the Jews are the blessed children of truth and the sprout that was perfumed on Mount Sinai, so that all impurity was removed from them. The Jews were all perfumed, joining the holy union, and they remain perfect day and night in all respects. As to the other nations of the earth, it is very difficult to cleanse them, and even after their conversion to Judaism they remain impure up to the third generation. This is why we received this teaching: ‘Kill the best of the goyim.’ ”[2]

The Talmud also says: “Take the life of the most honest of the idolaters.”[3] And some sheets earlier: “If one pulls a goy out of the pit into which he has fallen, one supports a man in idolatry.”[4]

Another quotation: “If a goy has fallen into a pit, it must be covered with a stone.” Rashi adds: “All means that can be used by the goy to get out of the pit must be destroyed.”[5]

Maimonides writes: “It is forbidden to feel sympathy for an idolater. Therefore, if one sees an idolater who has fallen into a river or who is in mortal danger, one must not save him.”[6]

There are various justifications for these radical precepts. For example: “The seven nations of Canaan, which were supposed to be exterminated by the Israelites, did not disappear completely but were scattered among the other nations of the earth. As a result, Maimonides

teaches that one must kill a goy whenever possible, because that goy can be a descendant of those seven nations and the Jew breaks the law every time he has the opportunity to kill but fails to do so: the precept to exterminate the seven nations of Canaan is valid at all times.”[7]

Furthermore: “Anyone who rejects a precept of the Jewish religion is a heretic and an epicurean. One must hate, despise and exterminate him, for it is said: ‘Should I not hate those who hate you, Lord?’ ”[8]

Also: “One who wants to kill an animal but kills a man by mistake, as well as one who wants to kill a pagan [or a foreigner according to other versions] but kills a Jew by mistake, is not guilty.”[9]

Curiously, it is said many times that the murder of a Jew is the most heinous crime, so the reasons to justify such a thing need to be very strong.

The Talmud further says that one who denies God can be murdered.[10] We also read: “If a heretic or a traitor falls into a pit, you must *not* pull him out. If there is a ladder in the pit, you must take it away and say: ‘I am taking the ladder away so that my cattle will not go down it.’ And if there was a stone on top of the opening, you must put it back and say: ‘I am doing it so that my cattle can walk here.’ ”[11]

According to the Talmud, it is fair to kill any heretic with your own hands.[12] The rabbis, for their part, say that one who sheds the blood of the impious offers a sacrifice to God.[13]

“But who are the impious?” asks the Talmud. “The impious,” responds Rabbi Eliezer, “are Jesus and his followers.” Rabbi Yehoshua, however, argues that this term includes not only Jesus and his disciples, but all the pagans without exception.[14]

The commandment “you shall not kill” means that one must not kill a Jew, explains Maimonides.[15]

Those who reject the teachings of Israel, particularly the followers of the Nazarene, must be put to death. Killing them is always considered a good deed. If doing that openly is impossible, one must try to bring about their death by other means.[16]

This is entirely fair, because the captivity of Israel will only end when the foreign rulers are exterminated.[17]

Accordingly, those who kill Christians, foreigners and non-Jews in general will find an eternal reward in the fourth heavenly palace.[18]

Now, one who destroys a soul of Israel, says the Talmud, will be treated as if he destroyed the entire world, while one who saves a soul of Israel will be treated as if he saved the entire world.[19]

The Talmud also says the following (and Maimonides repeats it): “The child of Noah [i.e., the goy] who blasphemes, falls into idolatry, kills another goy or commits adultery with another goy’s wife is inno-

cent if he comes to embrace the Jewish faith. However, if he kills an Israelite and then becomes a Jew, he is considered guilty and must be put to death for murder.”[20]

A Jew who becomes a Christian is treated in the same way as a Christian or a goy. As a matter of fact, a Jew *is* allowed to convert to Christianity, but only for the sake of appearances, the reason being this: “If a Jew can deceive the goyim and make them believe he is a goy himself, he is allowed to do that.”[21]

At the same time: “If someone is baptized to gain some benefit but later comes to practice idolatry with other Christians, he is treated the same as a Christian. He must be thrown into a pit and left there.”[22]

We can often hear these hypocritical and barbarous teachings coming from the mouth of modern Jews, including those who are most imbued with reformism and humanitarian philosophy. They just cannot help but betray their true thoughts.

Thus, Heinrich Graetz, a rather cautious Jew as a rule, gets carried away at one point and comes to eulogize Börne and Heine in the following terms: “Outwardly, they moved away from Judaism, but only as fighters who put on the enemy’s armor and carry his banner so as to strike him harder and exterminate him more efficiently.”[23] As we can see, Graetz, professor at the rabbinic seminary in Breslau, treats Christians like enemies who must be exterminated, and he praises the use of highly perfidious and hypocritical means for doing that.[24]

In fact, the bloodthirsty nature of rabbinism has often been displayed throughout world history. When Saul, the future Apostle Paul, launched his campaign against Christians, he was breathing out murder.[25] The Acts of the Apostles tell us that wherever Christians went, the Jews would set the locals against them. The Jews themselves report in *Seder ha-Doroth* (a fact rarely noticed by historians) that in pagan Rome the rabbis brought forth the death of a large number of Christians.

Antoninus Pius is normally cleared of all accusations of hatred he might have felt towards Christians. However, as early as in 1781 Haffner disputed the authenticity of Antoninus’ edict in favor of Christians, and even though the emperor, as reported by Eusebius in his *Church History* (book IV, p. 26), supposedly prevented the outbursts of popular fury against Christians in certain cities, this detail does not change the fact mentioned in *Seder ha-Doroth*, p. 127. We can read there that Judah ha-Nasi, who was in Antoninus’ good graces, convinced the monarch that the Nazarenes’ malice was the cause of a recent plague and made him execute all the Nazarenes who lived in Rome, in the year 3915 (155 A.D.). The same page also tells that it was due to Jewish

efforts that Marcus Aurelius put all the Nazarenes to death. A bit earlier (p. 125), it says that in 3974 (214 A.D.) the Jews murdered 200,000 Christians in Rome and all the Christians of Cyprus.

Sefer Yuchasin (folio 108, Amsterdam ed., 1717) tells that during the time of Pope Clement I the Jews murdered a huge number of Christians (one "as countless as the sand of the sea") in Rome and outside the city. Later, the Jews made Diocletian execute numerous Christians, including Popes Caius and Marcellinus, as well as a brother of Caius' and his sister Rosa.

It is also well-known that the Jews found their way into the heart of Nero.[26]

As we can see, the precept to kill Christians is far from being a dead letter. The children of Israel have eagerly put it into practice whenever they could.

NOTES

[1] *Prof. Dr. Rohling*, p. 53.

[2] *Die Polemik*, pp. 19–20.

[3] Tr. Avodah Zarah, f. 26, 2, Tosafot; Soferim (Venice ed.), f. 13, 3.

[4] Tr. Avodah Zarah, f. 20, 1, Tosafot.

[5] *Die Polemik*, p. 20.

[6] Yad ha-Chazakah, 1, 10, 1, f. 40, 1.

[7] *Die Polemik*, p. 20.

[8] Abarbanel, *Rosh Amanah*, f. 9, 1. Maimonides on the Sanhedrin, f. 121, 2.

[9] Tr. Sanhedrin, f. 78, 2.

[10] Tr. Pesachim, f. 122, 2, Tosafot.

[11] Tr. Avodah Zarah, f. 26, 2.

[12] *Ibid.*, f. 4, 2, Tosafot.

[13] Yalkut Shimon on the Pentateuch, f. 245, 3; Bamidbar Rabbah, p. 21, f. 229, 3.

[14] *Prof. Dr. Rohling*, pp. 54, 3. Now, since those who attack or supposedly attack the Jews are considered particularly impious persons, it is not surprising that my life is in great danger. To start with, one anonymous Jew wrote to me from Hamm, saying that I deserved to be hanged like Haman. Similar threats were then sent to me by a Jew from Kreuzthal, who wrote as follows: "We believe that removing you from our path is a work pleasing to God. You will be removed from the earth with our hands." After that, letters of this kind would come to me in great numbers.

[15] Yad ha-Chazakah, 4, 1, f. 47, 1.

[16] *Prof. Dr. Rohling*, p. 56.

[17] *Ibid.*, pp. 80, 8.

- [18] Ibid., pp. 79, 4.
 - [19] Tr. Sanhedrin, f. 37, 1.
 - [20] Ibid., f. 71, 2; Yad ha-Chazakah, 4, 10, f. 295, 2.
 - [21] *Die Polemik*, p. 14.
 - [22] Ibid., pp. 14–15.
 - [23] *Geschichte der Juden*, vol. II, Leipzig, 1870.
 - [24] Cf. *Die Polemik*, p. 15.
 - [25] Acts of the Apostles 9:1.
 - [26] *Die Polemik*, p. 21.
-

CHAPTER 7

WOMAN

A Jew is allowed to dishonor a Christian woman. – Christian marriage is the same as mating between animals. – The meaning of lecherous dreams. – The behavior of various rabbis. – Jewish women.

Moses said: “You shall not covet your neighbor’s wife.” [Deuteronomy 5:21.] Or: “If a man commits adultery with the wife of his neighbor, he is to be put to death.” [Leviticus 20:10.] Now, the Talmud teaches that since God forbade a Jew to commit adultery with *his neighbor’s* wife, that is, the wife of *another Jew*, this prohibition does not apply to the wives of other persons, that is, the wives of the goyim.[1]

According to the Tosafot and Rashi (commentary on Leviticus 20:10), this means that there is no such thing as marriage between the goyim. This disgraceful principle is a natural consequence of another one, which deprives all non-Jews of human qualities, because marriage is a moral institution that only exists among human beings, while in the case of animals we deal with simple mating.

This opinion is shared by Bechai, Levi, Gershon and many other Jewish “sages”, so we can be certain that sleeping with a Christian woman is *not* considered adultery in the eyes of a Jew.

Even Maimonides, who is rather philosophical as a rule, says in a commentary that “one is allowed to dishonor an infidel woman”, that is, one who is not Jewish.[2]

A rather telling example – along with a precept – was provided by a French rabbi who lived in the 13th [sic; 12th] century. “Rabbeinu Tam teaches that an adulterous relationship between a Jew and a non-Jewish man or woman entails no punishment, because the Jewish law does not apply to their children and because it is said: ‘The semen of the goyim is like that of horses.’ This is why the rabbi in question allows a Jewish woman to marry a Christian man who becomes a Jew and with whom she has already lived together.” Even though marriage between those who already live together is strictly forbidden by the law, Rabbeinu Tam does allow it in this particular case, on the ground that “cohabitation between Christians is like that between animals”, and therefore, argues the rabbi, their past relations can be considered void.[3]

The Talmud says that one who dishonors his mother in a dream can

lay claim to wisdom, based on what we read in Proverbs 2:3: "Say to wisdom: 'You are my mother.' " Next, one who dishonors his bride can expect to master the law (see Deuteronomy 33:4), one who does it to his sister will acquire knowledge (see Proverbs 7:4), and one who does it to his neighbor's wife will enter eternal life.[4]

As these shameful acts result in such high rewards, it is only natural that a man will arduously wish to have dreams like that, which is kind of reprehensible. Moreover, the logical conclusion will be that if a mere dream offers such great prospects, reality will do the job even better.

In fact, Rabbi Kroner has already let us know that the Jew tormented by temptation is allowed by the Talmud to indulge in pleasure without actually committing a sin. All he has to do is act in secret so that the "holy name of Israel" will not be discredited.

The Talmud also says: "A girl three years and one day old is betrothed by intercourse, but if she has not reached that age yet, having intercourse with her is like putting a finger in an eye, so this is not a case of lost virginity, because her seal is expected to be restored, just like an eye only tears for a moment when a finger touches it." [5]

As we learn from the Talmud, many of the early rabbis, most notably Rab Nachman, asked public criers in every town they visited to find a woman who would be willing to be their "spouse" for a few days.[6]

Next, the Talmud reports Rabbi Elias saying that regardless of the Day of Atonement he would deflower as many virgins as possible, because the sin is committed outside the heart's door, without the soul's interior being affected by human malice.[7]

As to Rabbi Eliezer, the Talmud tells that there was no public woman in the entire world with whom he did not sleep. Having heard that one of them demanded a coffer filled with gold for her services, he obligingly took such a coffer, traversed seven rivers and finally managed to get to her. The rest of the story is too lecherous to be told here. But the most odious part is the conclusion: upon Rabbi Eliezer's death, God reportedly shouted from heaven that the "exemplary" rabbi entered eternal life. Now, since this account is preceded by the statement that heretics will not find the path of life even if they convert to Judaism, the moral of the story is this: Remain a faithful Jew no matter what, and you will be forgiven of everything in the end.[8]

The next in line is Rabbi Akiba, called the second Moses by the synagogue. It is reported that one day he saw a woman on a palm tree, and being as resolute as Eliezer, he went towards the tree and climbed it. The woman, however, turned out to be the devil in human disguise, who told Akiba: "I would not give a penny for your life if it was not said in heaven: 'Act with caution towards Akiba and his law.' " [9]

The same thing is told about Rabbi Meir and Rabbi Tarfon: the devil has no power over them, because they are protected by heaven in any situation and against any laws.

It should be recalled that anything done by rabbis is considered to be an observance of the law,[10] which helps us better understand why they behaved the way they did. Nor does it come as a surprise that the Talmud is full of obscenities, dirty jokes and scabrous stories that are highly reprehensible in the eyes of Christians and just cannot be told here.[11]

But what about the Jewish woman? What can she do when she sees her husband having a relationship with another woman under the same roof? According to the Talmud, she is not even allowed to complain. Also, when Rabbi Yochanan condemned certain sexual practices as being highly perverted and immoral, he was met with this objection: "No, the law is not like that, for our sages declared that a man can do anything he wants with his woman, as if it were a piece of meat brought from a butcher, one that can be eaten fried, cooked or roasted, or as if it were fish brought from a fisherman."

To corroborate these precepts, the following example is given. A woman once came to the rabbi and complained that her husband was sodomizing her. She received the following response: "My daughter, I can do nothing for you, because our law does not protect you!"

This shameful teaching can be found both in the old and new editions of the Talmud, such as those of Amsterdam (1644 and the following), Sulzbach (1769) or Warsaw (1864).[12]

Elsewhere, this precept is accompanied by an infamous commentary that is based on the misinterpretation of a biblical text. Thus, it is said that a Jew can do all those things with any woman he wants, while a Noahide (that is, a non-Jew) can only sodomize a woman who is also a Noahide.[13]

According to the Talmud, the presence of ten males is required to hold a public prayer in the synagogue.[14] Nine males and a million women would not constitute a complete assembly, and God would not be present at such a meeting, because women do not count.[15]

Again, not only is a Jewish woman forced by law to endure sodomy, but she is not entitled to complain when her husband has intercourse with a non-Jewish woman, all the less so because sleeping with such a woman is *not* considered adultery.

It looks like the Church was totally right when, based exclusively on what was written in Jewish religious books, it forbade young Christian girls to take service with Jews. Nor should we be astonished that so many Christian girls are dishonored by young Jewish fellows.

In view of all this, when we see Rabbi Kroner bragging that there are fewer illegitimate children among the Jews compared to other nations, we can easily figure out the true reasons for it. First, the Talmud allows the Jew to practice debauchery without breaking the family ties in the process, and secondly, it allows him to sodomize a Jewish woman in order to avoid any unwanted offspring. Add to this the instinctive repulsion felt by men of our race towards Jewish women, and we will fully understand why statistics speak of so few out-of-wedlock births among the Chosenites.

To sum it up: the Jew can protect a Jewish woman from unwanted pregnancy by sodomizing her, and if he dishonors a Christian woman, her children will simply not be registered as Jews. We know a lot of Jews who could confirm our words with their own experience.

Therefore, the small number of illegitimate births among the Jews does not mean that the morality of our women is inferior to that of Jewish ones. Subjected as they are to unnatural vices by the Talmud – that is, by a sacred authority, since the Talmud preserves and continues the Bible if we were to believe Rabbi Kroner – Jewish women have no right to consider themselves superior to our women in small towns and villages.

As to big cities, this is where Jewish women can fully display their true nature, and it is actually they who make up most of the workforce in brothels. Here is an honest confession from a present-day Jewish newspaper, *Archives Israélites*: “For a quarter of a century, the moralists have been wondering not without reason: How come there are more Jews than Christians among loose women in the large cities of Europe? Sadly, this is a valid question, since in Paris, London, Berlin, Hamburg, Vienna, Warsaw and Krakow, in what we call the demimonde, on public squares and even in brothels, we encounter more Jewish women than Christian ones, taking into account the ratio between the two populations. It is not pleasant to state such a fact, but as painful as it is to admit, this is the case.”[16]

Every cloud has a silver lining, though. In another issue, the same newspaper writes: “A character actress, who was born a Jew and never forgot about it, has recently died. Mademoiselle Judith Ferreira had a very pleasant appearance. Her funeral was a Jewish one, just like her soul had always been, and even though she indulged in practices inherent to the theatrical profession, just like so many other women do, at least she piously kept the traditions of hearth and home.”[17]

In a word, everything will be forgiven to you provided that you stay firmly and faithfully attached to the Jewish nation.

NOTES

- [1] Tr. Sanhedrin, f. 52, 2.
- [2] Yad ha-Chazakah, 2, 2, on Kings [?], No. 2, 3.
- [3] *Prof. Dr. Rohling*, p. 62.
- [4] Tr. Berakhot, f. 57, 1.
- [5] Tr. Niddah, f. 47, 2.
- [6] Tr. Yoma, f. 18, 2.
- [7] *Ibid.*, f. 19, 2.
- [8] Tr. Avodah Zarah, f. 17, 1.
- [9] Tr. Kidushin, f. 81, 1.
- [10] Tr. Berakhot, f. 62, 1; tr. Chagigah, f. 5, 2.
- [11] See tr. Sanhedrin, f. 22, tr. Shabbat, f. 149, 2, tr. Nazir, f. 23, tr. Sota, f. 10, etc. etc.
- [12] Tr. Nedarim, f. 20, 2.
- [13] Tr. Sanhedrin, f. 58, 2.
- [14] Tr. Megillah, f. 23, 2.
- [15] P.L.B. Drach, *De l'harmonie*, vol. 2, Paris, 1844, p. 335.
- [16] *Archives Israélites*, 1867, No. 15, p. 711.
- [17] *Ibid.*, June 1, 1868, No. 11, pp. 522–523.

CHAPTER 8

OATH

The Jews are not bound by an oath taken before Christians. – Perjury and mental reservation are allowed. – Rabbinical hypocrisy and casuistry. – How to avoid obligations undertaken under oath.

The Jews have repeatedly complained that the oath they took during their disputes with non-Jews was received with distrust. Obliging, some Christian scholars have showed a more lenient attitude in this regard. We would love to agree with those scholars, but sadly for them, our opinion is totally different from theirs.

Before producing concrete evidence in support of our words, evidence that is both numerous and conclusive, let us do some logical reasoning.

It is obvious that a sincere and trustworthy oath simply does not fit into the rabbinical system of thought. Indeed, why should one take an oath before an animal? That would make no sense, because the oath is the last means to settle a dispute *between people*. Consequently, when the Talmudic Jew is asked to take an oath in favor of or against a Christian, he is made to perform a senseless action, one he would never do on his own initiative. He is made to utter some empty words, which have zero value in his eyes and do not bind him in any way.

Furthermore, since the Talmud makes it clear that the property of the goyim – as well as their life – rightfully belongs to the Chosenites, what should we possibly expect from a property dispute with a son of Israel? According to the Talmudic law, a Jew is fully entitled to take possession of anything within reach, so how could we think him capable of saying – let alone swearing under oath – that *his* money is *someone else's* money when he firmly believes in the validity of his right of ownership?

Therefore, when a Jew is asked to make such a statement or take such an oath, one of the following happens. If his willpower is just as strong as his beliefs, he responds: "I'd rather die than commit such an injustice." And if he is weak, he lets the fear of retribution prevail over the "truth", but not without saying to himself: "This money is mine anyway, and I'll take it back at the first opportunity, for this matter cries out to the Lord!"

As we read the Talmud, we can see many famous rabbis setting examples of this kind for the Talmudic Jew to follow.

Thus, Rabbi Akiba once swore an oath and said in his heart that it was not valid.[1]

Another prominent rabbi, Yochanan, being asked by a high-ranking woman to keep a certain secret, swore as follows: "In the presence of the God of Israel, I will never reveal it." Logically, this meant that the rabbi promised to tell nothing out of respect for God and his holy name, or so that woman thought. However, while taking the oath, the rabbi said to himself: "I will reveal nothing in the presence of God, but I will reveal everything to the people of Israel." [2]

One is allowed to mentally repudiate the oath, says *Yoreh Deah*, every time he or she is forced to take it.[3] Therefore, when Christian judges or other authorities order a Jew to take an oath, they should keep in mind that he or she is not bound to tell the truth, because the oath is a forced one and the above Talmudic principle applies.

Yoreh Deah further says: "If a king orders a Jew to take an oath and tell if another Jew has sinned with a non-Jewish woman, so as to know whether that Jew should be put to death, the oath is considered a forced one and must be mentally repudiated." [4]

Yet another rabbi teaches along the same lines: "If a prince tells a Jew to swear that he will not leave the country, the Jew must add to himself: 'Not today.' And if the prince makes the Jew swear that he will *never* leave the country, the Jew must say to himself: 'Under such and such circumstances.'" [5]

There is one important prerequisite for this, though: "It is only allowed to break the oath when the idolaters cannot realize it. But if they can, breaking the oath is forbidden, so as not to profane the name of God. This is why Zedekiah was punished [by God]: he broke the oath he had given to Nebuchadnezzar, even though it was a forced one." [6]

The Jews often boast of their loyalty to the military oath, but it is pretty obvious that if they were to break this kind of oath, the "idolaters" would have no difficulty discovering it. The fact is, this behavior is in line with the theory repeatedly brought forward by the rabbis: a sin is forgiven if it remains hidden; all you have to do is take the necessary precautions to avoid being discovered, so that the Jewish religion and nation will not be compromised, or as the rabbis say in their language of "good apostles", "so as not to profane the holy name of God". [7]

Indeed, "God's name is only profaned or tarnished when a goy realizes that the Jew lies". [8] Or: "God's name is not profaned if, for example, a goy inherits his father's property and a Jew lies to him by saying: 'I gave that to your father prior to his death.' The reason is that the goy

has no way of knowing for sure that the Jew lies, because the witness – the goy's father – has died.”[9]

This allows us to fully appreciate the perfidy and hypocrisy of the following precepts:

“A Jew is allowed to take a false oath before a sovereign (that is, before a king or another authority) each time he is asked to do something he is not bound to do *according to the Jewish laws*. Still, great care must be taken to avoid being discovered, so that the name of God will not be profaned.”[10]

“If a Jew steals from a goy and the goyish court orders the Jew to take an oath, his brethren must tell him to reach an agreement with the goy in question, so that the Jew will not take a false oath that can lead to the profanation of God's name. But if no agreement can be reached and the Jew can take an oath without profaning God's name, he is allowed to take a false oath and repudiate it in his heart.”[11]

Furthermore, according to a whole number of rabbis, a Jew firmly believes that on the Day of Atonement all his sins, including very serious ones, such as perjury, are forgiven to him, without it being necessary for him to make any restitution.[12]

A Christian, too, believes in the remission of sins, but he knows that it is conditioned by the return of stolen property and the compensation of the moral damage he caused to his neighbor.

To end up describing the Jewish line of behavior in a court of law, let us add that a Jew is forbidden to testify against his brethren, and if need be, he must take as many as twenty false oaths rather than compromise another Jew. In fact: “If a Jew testifies in court and reveals information favorable to a goy and unfavorable to another Jew, he or she is to be subjected to the harshest form of excommunication.”[13]

It is in agreement with these principles that a contemporary rabbi named Chatam Sofer (born as Moses Schreiber), who has recently died, allowed one Viennese Jew to take a false oath. The man's wife had bought stolen weapons, with his consent, and the rabbi instructed him to swear that *he* had not bought those weapons and at the same time think to himself that it was his wife who had bought them.[14]

Furthermore, the Jews are openly taught as follows: “We can and must perjure when the goyim ask us if our sacred books contain anything against them. We must answer in the negative, because the goyim might get angry with us if they were to learn the truth.”[15]

None of the above facts, however, has been able to change the opinion of the Christian scholars we have alluded to earlier on. The best they came up with was the following suggestion: let us ask the Jews to swear the oath that is normally taken in the synagogue and is accompa-

nied by terrible maledictions [lest it be broken]. This way, assure these scholars, the Jews will be less willing to perjure.

This suggestion deserves some consideration. Still, I cannot help but argue as follows: If I was a Talmudist and regarded the rabbinical teachings as coming from God, I would be fully entitled to mentally repudiate any oath I was forced to take. That would be logical and perhaps even a duty, for how could anyone make me swear, for instance, that my house is not actually mine? I would insult God if I accepted to say anything like that. Now, since mental reservation was legitimated by the example of Rabbi Akiba, the second Moses, I would swear anything I was forced to, but I would make sure to think exactly the opposite to myself. And if the most precious thing – my life – was at stake and I was, say, accused of murdering a Christian, I would be entitled to swear that I killed no human being while thinking to myself: “It was an animal I killed.”

Any unbiased person will have to agree that it makes perfect sense to take false oaths like that.

What we have said so far is more than enough to clarify the matter, so we will only briefly touch on some other details.

To start with, on the Day of Atonement, Yom Kippur, the Jews recite a traditional prayer, one unrelated to the total remission of sins we have mentioned earlier on. The prayer says: “Let all vows, obligations, penalties and oaths that will be made, accepted and taken by us after this Day of Atonement and before that of the next year be cancelled, remitted and rendered null and void! Let our vows not be considered vows, and our oaths not be considered oaths!”

This act is performed in a solemn manner on the evening of Yom Kippur, the above prayer being read by the master of ceremony, who is assisted by two of the main rabbis. Prior to that, the three of them make a solemn introduction in the name of God.[16]

Furthermore, every single Jew can be relieved of any oath at any time by a rabbi or simply by three ordinary Jews.[17]

True, various Jewish authors claim that these things are only practiced for vows and oaths that were taken in haste, ones that pertain to personal matters and do not concern other people. We would be glad to believe those authors, but the atmosphere of great solemnity that permeates the said ceremony, on the evening of the Day of Atonement, makes us strongly doubt the veracity of their words.

Our doubts are supported by converted Jewish scholars, who consider this explanation to be a mere subterfuge. Needless to say, their conversion does not mean that they should *not* be trusted. If anything, their sense of duty has made them publicly reveal principles harmful to society.

One of these converts, Johann Schmidt, points out that the rabbis consider themselves empowered to relieve God himself of his oaths.

Numerous other converts, such as Brenz or Drach (a man of worth and knowledge, even though some have tried hard to belittle him), fully agree on this subject, and their testimonies confirm everything we said about the Jewish oath.

NOTES

[1] Tr. Kallah, f. 18, 2.

[2] Tr. Avodah Zarah, f. 28, 1; tr. Yoma, f. 84, 1.

[3] Shulchan Aruch, Yoreh Deah, No. 232, pars. 12 and 14.

[4] Ibid.

[5] Shailoth Uteshuvoth, f. 25, 2.

[6] Yoreh Deah, op. cit.

[7] Chagigah, f. 16; Kiddushin, f. 40; Maimonides, Yad ha-Chazakah, 4, 11, f. 31, 1; Moses Mikkotsi, Sefer Mitzvot Gadol, f. 132. Cf. Baba Kamma, f. 113.

[8] *Die Polemik*, p. 13.

[9] Ibid.

[10] *Prof. Dr. Rohling*, p. 65.

[11] Ibid.

[12] Midrash Talpiyot on Psalm 15, f. 13, 2; Yalkut Shimoni on Psalms, f. 94, 4, No. 665; Yalkut Chadash, f. 121, 1, 3, No. 1, 11; Kad ha-Kemach, f. 43, 4; Sefer Hasidim, f. 4, No. 20, etc.

[13] *Prof. Dr. Rohling*, pp. 66–67.

[14] Ibid., p. 66.

[15] *Die Polemik*, p. 14.

[16] Prague Machzor, vol. II, f. 91, a.

[17] Sefer Mitzvot Gadol, f. 70, 1.

CHAPTER 9

CHRISTIANS

The terms “pagans”, “idolaters”, “foreigners”, etc. refer mainly to Christians. – Rabbi Zevi’s hypocrisy in this regard. – Numerous evidence as to the true meaning of these terms. – Harmful consequences.

When dealing with us, the Jews keep using a skilful subterfuge: they vigorously claim that they do not actually consider Christians to be the *goyim*, *akum*, heretics, idolaters, etc., and therefore none of the Jewish rules of behavior towards those categories of people applies to Christians. “Yes,” say the Jews, “we might be allowed to do whatever we want with the belongings, women and life of heretics, idolaters or foreigners, but that does not include Christians, because they are not designated with these terms.”

The *Archives Israélites* newspaper pretends to get indignant at those Christians who “have no scruples about associating Christians with something that *obviously* concerns idolaters only”. [1]

However, we have seen that a Jew can and must say under oath that his sacred books contain nothing against us, for fear that the truth might make us angry with him. We also know that he is allowed to lie at any time for the sake of peace. In what follows, we will see that these teachings are faithfully preserved and followed both by the good apostles of Jewish reformism and by the fanatics of Talmudism.

Given that the Jewish doctrines depict Jesus Christ as a creature and an ordinary man rather than as a god, it can be safely concluded that Christians are idolaters in the eyes of the Jews, for idolatry means worshipping a creature. True, certain forms of idolatry can be more or less pure. For instance, the rites of the ancient Persians were perhaps less odious than those of the nations of Canaan. When viewed from this perspective, some forms of idolatry are more righteous than others. But nevertheless, a religion that shows reverence to a creature has to be regarded as an idolatrous and pagan cult.

These principles make it obvious that everything the Jewish books say about the *goyim* – that is, the pagans – refers to Christians as well. Just as obvious is that the trick to give Christians the names of nations that no longer exist is entirely in line with the spirit of Judaic teachings.

Thus, Rabbi Zevi tells that he once tried to convince some Chris-

tians that the Jews, in fact, had never considered them to be the goyim. Unable to do so, he then tried to make them believe that the term "goy" was actually not an insult. This second trick failed just like the previous one did, for the very first son of Israel who was called a goy angrily protested against being addressed that way.

It should also be mentioned that the latest edition of the Talmud published in Warsaw (1863–64) carefully avoids using the word "goy" and replaces it with a circumlocution.

The term "akum", for its part, designates foreign nations in general and Christians in particular, because it is said: "When a Jew prays and meets an akum who holds a cross, he will not bow down even if he reaches the part where he must do that; instead, he will merely tell God that he had that intention." [2] An akum who holds a cross is obviously a Christian.

Maimonides, the "Eagle", tells with a surprising frankness that there is actually no difference between Christians and idolaters: "And let it be known that all those Nazarenes who follow Jesus' delusions are idolaters, even if their doctrines might differ, so one must act towards them just like one does towards idolaters." [3]

The word "goy", too, designates a Christian, as we already know. The following quotation is yet another evidence of it: "The Jews who get baptized [in a sincere manner] mix themselves with the goyim, and one must not say about anyone of them: 'Let your brother live with you!' The law says that they must be thrown into a pit." [4]

The same is true of the term "minim" (heretics): "One day, Eleazar ben Dama was bitten by a snake and a Christian doctor wanted to treat him in the name of his master Jesus, but Rabbi Ismael forbade that, for one should not be treated by a heretic." [5]

Another rabbi, Akiba, as he heard a Christian making a clever commentary, felt great satisfaction, but then he bitterly repented of it, for that satisfaction was a step towards heresy. [6]

Another term used for Christians is "foreigners". Rabbi Jacob ben Meir, best known as Rabbeinu Tam, lived in France in the 12th century and, as we learn from Jewish books, made a great fortune by usury. He claimed that practicing usury against foreigners was allowed, and he obviously had no problem fleecing French Christians, because they were foreigners to him. [7]

Hence, even though the Talmud, as evidenced by a 12th-century text, [8] might distinguish Christians from other pagans, such as Persians or Canaanites, it is equally true that the Talmud considers Christians to be the real akum, the real pagans and the real idolaters.

For instance, we read that the holidays of idolaters include the first

day of the week, “the Nazarene’s day” – in other words, Christian Sunday.[9]

When the Talmud calls Jesus Christ “the carpenter’s son”, it borrows the name given to him by his Jewish contemporaries (Matthew 13:55).[10]

When the Talmud distorts Jesus Christ’s name to form a phrase meaning “may his name and memory be erased”, [11] this agrees with a previously mentioned Talmudic teaching, one commanding a Jew to kill the heretic who has abandoned Judaism. Needless to say, Christ’s name and memory can only be erased when all Christians are killed.

When the Talmud calls Jesus Christ an idol,[12] this implies that Christians are all idolaters, because they happily serve this “idol”.

When the Talmud claims that Jesus practiced magic and idolatry,[13] it means that Christians are doubly idolatrous.

When the Talmud calls Jesus a madman,[14] this is in line with the insults received by him from Herod and others, who claimed that he was a magician and had made a pact with the devil.

When the Talmud calls Jesus an impious and godless person,[15] it means that Christians, the worshippers of such a person, are just as impious and godless.

Now, the Jews are taught, among other things, that the best of the goyim must be killed, and we can see that Christians are definitely included into this category, that of the goyim, the idolaters, the impious.

Rashi throws off the mask and calls things by their name: “The best of Christians must be strangled to death.”[16]

To make it clear to its readers that one speaks about Christians here, the Talmud says: “A goy who studies the law deserves death.”[17] As we know, a goy is only allowed to study the Jewish law if he becomes a Jew by circumcision, but the fact is that Christians are those who have always studied the law of Moses.

Some rabbis object to this by saying that the Talmud compares a goy who studies the law with a great priest,[18] but elsewhere the Talmud specifies that the law in question is that of the seven commandments of Noah.[19] Besides, we should bear in mind that the contradictions in the Talmud allow the Talmudic Jew to act as he wishes.

The Talmud also says in no uncertain terms: “Christians are idolaters, but it is still allowed to do business with them on the first day of the week, which is their day of rest.”[20]

Several sheets further on, Christian services, priests, candles and chalices are mentioned, and all of that is called idolatrous.[21]

Yet further on, it is asked whether a Jew can praise the houses of pagans among which he lives,[22] and the response is this: “He can, be-

cause the pagans do not keep their idol in their houses all the time. They only bring it in when one of them is about to die.”[23]

It is then added in a straightforward manner: “All the nations, without exception, are idolaters.”[24]

The rabbis of later times are of the same opinion.

Thus, Rashi says: “A Nazarene is one who embraces the erroneous teachings of that man who told his followers to honor the first day of the week.”[25]

Maimonides, as we have already seen, writes this: “Christians, the followers of Jesus’ delusions, are all idolaters despite some differences between their doctrines, and the Talmud clearly teaches that one must act with them just like one acts with idolaters.”[26] There we have it: a confession as to the actual Talmudic teachings coming straight from the Eagle’s mouth, so to speak. Elsewhere, the same person writes: “The Edomites [i.e., Christians] are idolaters, and the first day of the week is a holy day for them.”[27]

Kimchi, the famous rabbi, even knows the reason why the German Christians in particular belong to the worst category of pagans, the Canaanites: “The people of Germany are the Canaanites, because after the Canaanites had fled from Joshua, they went to the country of Alemania, known today as Germany. This is why the Germans are still called the Canaanites.”[28] Elsewhere, Kimchi says: “Christians are idolaters, because they prostrate themselves before a cross.”[29]

Next, the Talmud calls Jesus Christ “a Jewish apostate”,[30] and Maimonides writes: “It is commanded to kill the traitors of Israel and the heretics, such as Jesus of Nazareth and his followers, and throw them into the pit of perdition.”[31]

Jesus’ doctrine is a heresy, further says the Talmud.[32] It also says that Jacob, one of Jesus’ disciples, was a heretic.[33] Elsewhere, the Gospels are called “books of heretics”.[34]

Christians, maintains Abarbanel, are heretics, because they believe that the divinity has flesh and blood.[35] Maimonides, too, says that a heretic is anyone who claims that God took a bodily form.[36]

A book entitled *Nizzahon Vetus* (p. 47) comments on Numbers 17:8 as follows: “The heretics say that this refers to Charia (manure), that is, Mary [Maria], who allegedly remained virgin after giving birth to Jesus, may her spirit die!”

The same book (p. 70) says this on Jeremiah 31:31: “The heretics say that these words are a prophecy on Jesus, who prescribed disgraceful baptism to them instead of circumcision, as well as the celebration of the first day of the week instead of Saturday.”

Consequently, when a Jewish book of law states (in agreement with all rabbinic teachings) that a Jew must openly kill heretics whenever he

can or else bring about their death by other means,[37] when the Talmud teaches that one has the right to exterminate heretics by force of arms,[38] when the Talmud speaks about foreigners wallowing in the most abominable vices, such as murder, lechery, pederasty or bestiality (zoophilia),[39] all that refers not only to the idolatrous nations that disappeared thousands of years ago, but to all non-Jews in general and Christians in particular.[40]

NOTES

- [1] *Archives Israélites*, 1867, No. 12, p. 554 [sic; p. 546].
- [2] *Die Polemik*, p. 6.
- [3] *Ibid.*, p. 7.
- [4] *Ibid.*, p. 8.
- [5] *Ibid.*, p. 9.
- [6] *Ibid.*
- [7] *Ibid.*, pp. 9–10.
- [8] Tr. Challah, f. 13, 2; Avodah Zarah, f. 1, 1, Tosafot, etc. This refers to the unabridged editions.
- [9] Avodah Zarah, f. 2, 1, f. 6, 1, f. 7, 2.
- [10] *Ibid.*, f. 50, 2.
- [11] *Ibid.*, f. 17, 1.
- [12] *Ibid.*, f. 27, 2.
- [13] *Ibid.*
- [14] Tr. Shabbat, f. 104, 2.
- [15] Tr. Sanhedrin, f. 105, 1.
- [16] On Exodus, Amsterdam ed., f. 7, 1. In the Venice edition, we read “the best of the heretics”, which proves that the two terms are identical.
- [17] Tr. Sanhedrin, f. 59, 1.
- [18] *Ibid.*
- [19] Tr. Avodah Zarah, f. 3, 1.
- [20] *Ibid.*, f. 2, 1.
- [21] *Ibid.*, f. 14, 2.
- [22] *Ibid.*, f. 21, 1.
- [23] *Ibid.*, f. 23, 4.
- [24] *Ibid.*, f. 26, 2.
- [25] On Avodah Zarah, f. 6, 1.
- [26] On Avodah Mish. [Perush ha-Mishnah], 3, f. 78, 3.
- [27] Yad ha-Chazakah, Hilkhoh Avodah Zarah, f. 9, 4, Ven. ed., 1550.
- [28] On Obadiah 1:20.
- [29] On Isaiah 2:18, 20.
- [30] Tr. Gittin, f. 57, 1.
- [31] Yad ha-Chazakah, Hilkhoh Avodah Zarah, ch. 10. Some editions say: “Zadok, Baithos and their followers.”

[32] Tr. Avodah Zarah, f. 17, 1.

[33] Ibid., f. 27, 2.

[34] Tr. Shabbat, f. 116, 1.

[35] Mark. Hamish, f. 110, 3, on the Deuteronomy 32:21.

[36] Hagg. Maimon., Meir's Hilkhoh Teshuba, ch. 3.

[37] Arba Tur., Yoreh Deah, 4, 158, f. 35, 4; Choshen Mishpat, f. 138, 1, 2.

[38] Tr. Avodah Zarah, f. 4, 2, Tosafot.

[39] Cf. Avodah Zarah, f. 25, 2, f. 26, 1; Jerusalem Talmud, Avodah Zarah, f. 40, 3; Tosafot on Avodah Zarah, f. 2, 1, f. 14, 2, f. 21, 1, etc. etc.

[40] Some nice thoughts on the vices and wickedness of Christians can be found in the following text, one taken not from a 12th-century rabbinical treatise but from a modern Jewish newspaper, *Archives Israélites* (March 1, 1868, pp. 199–200). These thoughts were brought about by a custom that still existed in some countries and which consisted in specifying that a defendant was Jewish. Here is what we read [see also the note below]:

“When a member of the Church of England, a Roman Catholic, a Methodist, a Baptist or Dissenter of any kind picks a pocket, robs a till, breaks open a house, passes bad money, or receives stolen goods, he does no more than what people in general know well enough that many others of his persuasion are quite capable of. They see nothing extraordinary in the commission of any theft or fraud by a fellow-Christian. But when a rogue or a thief happens to profess the Jewish religion, that does appear to them a very extraordinary circumstance. As such it strikes the reporters. When they note that the culprit is a Jew, what they mean to denote is that he is a scandalous exception to the generality of Jews.”

JRBooksOnline: The above text is actually borrowed from *Punch* (January 11, 1868, p. 12), a British magazine of humor and satire, and is apparently *clever sarcasm*. It was written in response to a British Jew who had complained that “whereas when a Christian of any denomination is charged before a Magistrate with any act of dishonesty, reporters never mention his religious creed, whenever the person accused of such an offence is one of the Hebrew community, they always take care to describe the prisoner as a Jew”.

CHAPTER 10

EXCOMMUNICATION

Reasons for excommunication. – Two kinds of excommunication: niddui and herem. – How the herem is pronounced.

We are now familiar with the law of the Talmudic Jew. It remains to say a few words on the practice known as excommunication.

For the sake of self-preservation, any society, especially a religious one, needs to exclude its refractory members who refuse to obey the law. Conservative Judaism with its Talmud and rabbis is not an exception: it, too, practices excommunication. Today, when the Jewish and liberal world keeps harping on the excommunication practices of the Catholic Church, it is all the more necessary to know what the sages of Judaism have prescribed to their brethren in this regard.

Among the reasons for excommunication, the following are worth mentioning.[1] A Jew is to be excommunicated if he: a) shows contempt for a rabbi, including after the rabbi's death; b) shows contempt for the words of a rabbi or those of the law; c) prevents anyone from observing the law; d) sells his field to a goy; or e) testifies against his fellow Jew in a goyish court.[2]

Excommunication can be of three kinds. One of them has long gone out of use, so it will be enough to describe the two others, called niddui and herem.

Niddui, the milder form of excommunication, means that the excommunicated person must live separately from everyone. Except for his wife, children and household, nobody can approach him closer than four cubits. While he serves his punishment, he cannot shave or wash.

Ten men, as we have seen, constitute a holy assembly. Now, if only nine men are present, the excommunicated person cannot be the tenth. And if he enters a holy assembly of ten persons, he must stay at a distance of four cubits from them.

If he dies before his punishment ends, a judge places a stone on his coffin, to show that the deceased person deserved to be stoned, for he was excluded from the community and died without repenting. Accordingly, he is not mourned and nobody attends his funeral, not even his own parents.

This kind of excommunication can be pronounced even by a simple

private person, and its strictness may vary depending on the circumstances. It lasts 30 days, and if the excommunicated person has not repented, it can be extended up to 60 or even 90 days.[3]

Herem is the harshest form of excommunication, one pronounced if no repentance has taken place. While niddui allows the excommunicated person to stay together with his brethren, albeit keeping a distance of four cubits from them, herem forbids any kind of communication whatsoever.

The excommunicated person cannot study with others, nor can he teach anyone. He cannot eat or drink with anyone. Nobody is allowed to render any service to him. Accepting any service from him is equally forbidden. It is only allowed to sell him food, so that he does not die from hunger.

The herem must be pronounced by at least ten persons. The ceremony is performed in an atmosphere of great solemnity. Candles are lighted, a trumpet is played, and the most horrible curses are uttered against the sinner (see below). Once the act is over, all the lights are extinguished, to symbolize that the miscreant has been forever deprived of heavenly light.

The text of the herem is as follows:

“By the verdict of the Lord of Lords, A., son of A., is to be excommunicated in both the heavenly and earthly courts. Let him be excommunicated by the highest saints, by the seraphim and the ophanim, and finally, by all communities, large and small!

“Let all great plagues, all serious and horrible diseases befall him! Let his house become a lair of dragons! Let his star get darkened by the clouds, let it become angry and furious with him, let it be cruel to him! Let his corpse be thrown to wild animals and snakes! Let his enemies and opponents triumph over him! Let his gold and silver be given to others, and let his children be at the mercy of his enemies! Let his descendants be appalled at his fate!

“Let him be cursed by Addirion and Achtariel, by Sandalphon and Adrael, by Ansisiel and Patchiel, by Seraphiel and Sagansael, by Michael and Gabriel, by Raphael and Mesharetiel![4]

“Let him be excommunicated by Zaphzavif and by Hafhavif, who is the great God, by the seventy names of the triply great king, and finally, by Tsortak, the great chancellor.

“Let him be swallowed up [by the earth] like Korah and his army were! Let his soul depart him in fear and terror! Let the wrath of God kill him! Let him be strangled to death like Ahitophel was! Let his leprosy be like that of Gehazi! Let him fall and never get up! Let no grave of Israel ever receive him! Let his wife be given to others and let others live with her after his death!

“Let A., son of A., be subjected to this excommunication and let it be his heritage!

“As to myself and all of Israel, may the peace and blessing of God be upon us! Amen!”[5]

NOTES

[1] JRBooksOnline: Everything said below refers to a male person.

[2] Shulchan Aruch, Yoreh Deah, No. 334; cf. Choshen Mishpat, No. 28; Baba Kamma, 113, b.

[3] Yoreh Deah, op. cit.; Choshen Mishpat, No. 11; Yad ha-Chazakah, Hilkhos Talmud Torah, ch. 6, 7; Reshit Chochmah, ch. 7.

[4] JRBooksOnline: All these are names of angels.

[5] Buxtorf, *Lexicon Talmudicum*, No. 828.

PART FOUR

OUR CENTURY

CHAPTER 1

THE MODERN JEW

Are the Talmudic teachings still relevant today? – Philanthropy, supposedly a universal Jewish idea.

Levi ben Gershon, the famous rabbi, described the Talmud as a vast desert containing a few innocuous herbs and teeming with all kinds of wild and monstrous beasts.

We have just crossed this monster-filled desert, and we wonder if our progressive 19th century has been able to change the savage nature of the Talmudic Jew.

Bail, Crémieux and a good number of other Jews have been trumpeting about the existence of a universal Jewish idea, which is philanthropy, the love for mankind. Let us see if this is actually the case.

1

How much the Jews value human life. – The Vilna massacre. – Ritual murders of the 19th century.

In his account of the 1812 French-Russian war, Philippe-Paul de Ségur, a French general, relates an incident that happened in Vilna, where 20,000 members of the French army, including 7 generals and 300 officers, had retreated. He writes:

“The Lithuanians, whom we had previously abandoned after greatly compromising them, sheltered and helped some of our soldiers, but the Jews, whom we had protected, denied assistance to the others. More than that, the view of so much pain aroused Jewish greed. Now, if infa-

mous Jewish avarice had been limited to selling meager provisions at exorbitant prices, history would have been reluctant to soil its pages with this shameful detail. However, in addition to that, our wounded soldiers were made to go inside Jewish houses, where they were stripped [of their clothes and belongings]. Then, as the Russians approached, the Jews threw those naked and dying men out through the doors and windows, mercilessly leaving them to perish from cold. The Jewish barbarians thought that this kind of mistreatment would make them look good in the eyes of the Russians. Most certainly, such heinous crimes need to be reported both to our contemporaries and to the generations to come.”[1]

We have to admit that this story, one coming from an eyewitness, somewhat contradicts Bail’s and Crémieux’s claims about the inordinately humanitarian and philanthropic nature of Judaism.

These odious murders are not the only ones imputed to Jews by our century: they lead us to the subject of Jewish ritual murder, which we will briefly touch upon in what follows.

A book that suddenly became extremely rare, its disappearance being quite a mystery, reports a number of recent indisputable incidents that do not exactly corroborate the theory of Jewish philanthropy.[2]

The most stunning of those incidents, as well as the most notorious, is the Damascus murder of a Capuchin monk known as Father Thomas in 1840. Fabius, the Lyon rabbi whose speech we mentioned earlier on, had a rather singular idea to blame this crime on the Jesuits,[3] but here is the actual story of this famous case[4] as reported by Achille Laurent, the author of the book in question.

On February 5, 1840, Father Thomas, who was also a doctor, was seen going to the Jewish district. Later that day, he was followed by his servant. The next day, Father Thomas was expected to have dinner with the pasha’s doctor. However, it was discovered that he had not come back to his monastery. His parishioners were vainly searching for him.

At this point, the French consul took the matter into his own hands and found out that on the day of Father Thomas’s disappearance the barber of the Jewish district had been called to a Jewish merchant named Daoud Arari late in the evening. The barber then testified that as he came to Daoud’s house, he found Father Thomas tied up and lying on the floor, and was told to kill the man. He refused at first, but being intimidated by threats, he eventually agreed to participate in the murder.

Daoud Arari made the first stab, and his brother Aaroun made the second one, which proved to be fatal.[5] The victim’s flesh was then detached from the bones, which were crushed and thrown into a sewer.

The bones were later retrieved from there, along with a fragment of the jaw with the beard, a piece of head skin, where the tonsure could still be seen, and the monk's cap, which was well known to everyone in Damascus.

The murderers had also taken care to kill Father Thomas's servant, who had been searching for his master on the very evening of the crime. They had done it to get rid of a person that might have exposed them.

Seven Jewish merchants confessed to the crime and testified that several days earlier the great rabbi of Damascus had asked them to find Christian blood for upcoming Passover.

It has to be mentioned that the defendants were held in separate rooms and interrogated individually, but nevertheless their confessions agreed with each other down to the smallest detail.

The Chosenites from all over Europe then jumped into action to prevent the execution of the culprits and obtain their acquittal. They bitterly complained that people still believed in the existence of a cult that demanded the use of human blood.

Now, if the European Jews considered that their Damascus brethren were not guilty, why did they *not* bother to produce evidence of their innocence? Why did they offer money and gifts to every member of the French and Austrian consulates instead? Why would someone who has the truth on his side need to corrupt his judges?

The Jews offered 200,000 piasters to the head of the French foreign office [?] and 500,000 piasters to a lawyer. When all of that proved to be in vain, Crémieux got personally involved. Accompanied by a numerous retinue, he made his way to the Orient, where, with the aid of the British, he convinced the then ruler of Syria, Muhammad Ali, to sign a decree that said, among other things: "From the petition submitted by Crémieux, the representative of all the Europeans that profess the religion of Moses, we have understood that they desire the release of the Jewish defendants. And since it would not be reasonable to reject the wish of such a numerous [Jewish European] population, we order that the defendants be set at liberty."

The decree issued by Muhammad Ali does not even hint that the defendants are innocent. All it does is express the sovereign's will, one based on the wish of the numerous Jewish population of Europe, who desired that their brethren be merely released rather than acquitted.

But why did Crémieux *not* insist that the case be reexamined, so that the entire world could see that the Jewish defendants were innocent? Yes, everyone in the Orient is convinced that the Jews were guilty, but we know that Jewish influence and money can do wonders.

Curiously, the Jewish press carefully avoided discussing Laurent's book. Instead, the Chosenites decided to make it silently disappear, and they nearly succeeded at that.

A lot has been written on the ritual use of Christian blood by Jews in past centuries. There is so much evidence of this sinister practice that ignorance alone can be the reason why some people still have doubts about it. Palikowski, Eisenmenger and the *Annales Ecclesiastici* provide examples in this regard from every single century.

True, the Jews have often avoided conviction in a court of law, but that does not really prove anything in view of bribery and corruption. We have seen more than enough of it during the 1840 Damascus trial.

In 1831, a case dealing with the murder of a soldier's son by certain Jews was heard in Saint Petersburg, with the following outcome:

1) Two judges concluded that the murder was indeed committed by the Jewish defendants, for superstitious reasons.

2) One judge equally considered that the defendants were guilty as charged, but he asked for a milder punishment as the culprits committed the murder *believing that they served God*.

3) A fourth judge equally considered that the defendants were "undoubtedly guilty", but he, too, requested a milder punishment.

4) A fifth judge, having examined the facts of the case, was convinced that there were deluded Jews who still committed crimes of this kind, but at the same time he considered that the guilt of the defendants in this particular case was not sufficiently proven.

5) The public prosecutor sided with the first two judges.[6]

Now, Stobbe informs us that the defendants were eventually acquitted and released.[7]

Most certainly, no person should be convicted of a crime when there is not enough evidence of his or her guilt, but it is also true that a court verdict does not actually mean much. There are countless crimes that were condemned by history even though they had gone unpunished by the law.

Anyone who ponders over the above facts and who knows that trustworthy persons of all times have vigorously stigmatized the rabbinic thirst for blood just cannot calmly think about "the huge number of men, women and children (much greater than some believe) that disappear in certain big cities of Europe without leaving any trace behind, to the great stupefaction of those around them".[8]

The famous Tisza-Eszlar case, the incident that has just happened in Breslau, the great number of cases that have been recently reported in Hungary,[9] the Damascus trial, Eisenmenger's revelations and the numerous confessions of sincerely converted Jews unanimously tell

that pious and zealous Jews, particularly rabbis, are mad about Christian blood, which makes their Passover meal so much sweeter!

Hence, the best advice that can be given here is to avoid staying among the Jews. Just recall what has been established in the chapter "Murder".

Nothing, in fact, can be more curious than this glorification of murder and suicide, one so alien to Christian principles but so dear to the Jewish press and literature, which are modernized but easily recognizable heirs of the ancient Talmudic writings.

2

On property. – Jewish and Christian criminality. – Jewish usury in Alsace and elsewhere. – The Jewish question in Romania.

To be fair, most of the accusations made against the Jews in our century are related to property. In 1816, Bail confessed that out of 12 cases of theft or fraud considered by the Leipzig court, 11 involved Jewish culprits. Curiously, Bail cited this fact as an argument for Jewish emancipation, because, if we were to believe him, the French Jews became honest persons after being granted the rights of free citizens.[10]

Now, according to A. Cerfberr de Medelsheim, things are exactly the opposite. After analyzing statistical data from French prisons and making some simple calculations, he discovered that the incarceration rate among Jews was twice as big than that among Christians: there were 10 Jewish inmates per 10,000 Jewish citizens versus 5 Christian inmates per 10,000 Christian citizens.[11]

He then says: "The difference between the number of Jewish convicts and that of Christian ones becomes even greater when we [compare] the kinds of crimes that were committed [by the two groups]. The Jewish convicts are *not* farmers who were ruined by crop failure and went to the neighbor's field to appease their delirious hunger. They are *not* poor workers who had no job due to a commercial crisis and were thus compelled to break into the local bakery. They are *not* brawlers who were punished for violent acts and injuries. Those convicted for indecent assault are few in number as Jewish passion normally does not exceed the limits. Nor are they murderers, because murder involves a certain risk and therefore requires some courage, but we know that Jewish courage can only go so far.[12]

"No, the crimes committed by Jews are characterized by deeper perversity, being a result of reflection and premeditation. These crimes

are swindling, forgery, usury, fraudulent appropriation of property, intentional bankruptcy, smuggling, counterfeiting, deceit concerning recruitment, stellionate,[13] bribery, fraud, and finally malice [i.e., wrongful intention] in all its forms and with all its aggravations.

"And if we take into consideration that due to their nature, character and intelligence, as well as due to mental reservation that allows them to take a civil oath without being bound by it, the Jews are more cunning than Christians, then we have to conclude that the number of Jews who escape public condemnation must be superior to those who are behind bars and that major criminals are definitely *not* among the latter." [14]

The same author bitterly complains: "Usury has allowed the Jews to acquire the property of half of Alsace. This is the greatest plague of our time... Small property is being devoured by this omnivorous pest. We would need an entire volume to list all the disgraceful and perfidious means used by the Jews to lay their hands on the plots of land that have aroused their lust... It is no longer the Jews who put on a mantle of pain. Rather, it is the peasants of our villages who have to bear the iniquities of Israel." [15]

He also makes this observation: "The German Jew is the type and prototype of the Jew as we know him and as he is normally depicted. He is astute, greedy, rapacious, with no faith or law, albeit with a fanatical devotion... And if he prays to God, he only does so to demand material wellbeing." [16]

It is about the German Jew and his appropriation of property that Bismarck spoke with indignation in 1847 in the Prussian Parliament: "I know a region with numerous Jews in the countryside and with [Christian] peasants that do not own a thing. Everything in a peasant house, from bed to poker, belongs to the Jew. So does the cattle in the stable, for which the peasant has to pay the Jew a daily fee. So does the grain in the field and in the granary, and it is from the Jew that the peasant buys carefully measured grain for his bread, as well as that for sowing and fodder." [17]

During the same session, the Prussian minister of justice presented statistical data on crime, and after pointing out that the crime rate among the Jews was nearly twice as big compared to that among Christians, he concluded by saying that almost all Jewish crimes were related to property and were caused by greed or rapacity. [18]

Meinhold writes: "Knowledgeable people agree that Farther Pomerania, a province with one of the richest soils in all of Prussia, is so impoverished today mainly due to oppression and usury on the part of the Jews. They do not content themselves with a 10% or 12% interest

rate. I could give a lot of examples where, despite the highest loan guarantees, they imposed a 100% interest rate on people merely to help them out of a momentary crisis. Everything is done, negotiated and taken care of by the Jew. He sells maidservants, workers, household managers, estates and even brides... At certain times, particularly when the wool market is about to open, the Jews can be seen running in droves and pushing their hand trucks, where, if we were to listen to their own brethren, they pour lead to deceive peasants. In the town of S., where barely 12,000 people live, almost each of the numerous Jews is a banker carrying on a highly lucrative trade in government securities with wealthy peasants. In another place, the Jews have so thoroughly replaced the Christian traders that there has only remained one of the latter, and from what I heard, he is equally doomed.”[19][20]

Hermann Kuhn writes: “According to the criminal statistics, the Jews form the greatest part of the Vienna industrialists that are punished by the law, even though they make huge efforts to stay safe. Due to the Jewish press, which has abolished all Christian principles, there is no longer good faith or honesty in business. A major Jewish newspaper, *Die Presse*, has this slogan: ‘Equal rights for everyone!’ But granting equal rights to people who deny all the moral laws of Christianity means creating vampires [to suck blood from] those who still abide by the Christian laws on fraud and theft.”[21]

The pharmacist who swindled the entire Prussian army during the 1866 war by supplying counterfeit medicines to the military, a criminal who wanted to leave wounded soldiers without aid, was a German Jew.

Now, do you want to know the truth about the conflict between the Jews and the Romanians, one that is so much spoken about and which is far from being over? Ernest Desjardins, a French university professor, tackled this matter in a remarkable little book,[22] where the following facts were established:

“Every impartial person that peruses this book will find out that the Jews have been living in Romania not since the conquest of Jerusalem by Vespasian, as they pretend, but for several [decades] only. Today [1867], there are over 400,000 Jews in Romania.[23] Most of them are strangers to the country – both by birth and by will – in terms of customs, spirit and language, and they are bent on remaining that way. They shun no means to furiously exploit the country that took them in. They try hard to circumvent the laws and avoid duties binding for every citizen. They are liars and usurers. They are ignorant, superstitious, greedy, cunning and hideously dirty. Most certainly, religious reasons play no part in the [restrictive] government measures taken against the Jews or in the hostility displayed towards them by the population. Such is a

brief summary of the conscientious study carried out by Professor Desjardins.”[24]

All the above findings are actually confirmed by the statement of reasons in a draft law submitted to the Romanian parliament [in March 1868], where we can read, among other things:

The Jewish influx into Romania has increased so much in recent years that it came to frighten the native Romanians: they see themselves surrounded by a foreign and hostile race, a different ethnic group that is opposed to the interests of the Romanian nation.

The indifference shown so far to this hidden conquest of our economic and national fields has caused deep perturbations to the Romanian economy... Today, the Jewish population amounts to over 500,000 people, who are not affected by any local or social influence. This is due to the fact that the Jewish race differs from Romanians in its origin, customs, language, traditions, religion and morals. This race has established a monstrous monopoly within Romanian society, one that has completely destroyed trade and small industry, turning the Jews into absolute masters of our trade areas.

Working under these conditions has no beneficial effects anymore. The business seized by the Jews ruins the benefits of labor, because the business earnings that once went to Romanians and were then used to feed the sources of production through numerous channels are now alienated and diverted from the national economic field.

The concentration of our capital in foreign hands, in addition to posing danger to the economy, has a very negative effect on the moral condition of the Romanian state.

Possessing huge amounts of money and intrinsically inclined to exploit people of other races, the Jews, driven by their dominant rapacious instinct, have given themselves up to usury with no restraint whatsoever and on such a scale that they have robbed and impoverished thousands of wealthy families. Usury has become a hideous plague that spread itself all over the social body, drying up the very source of our nation's vital forces.

This monopoly of capital is the most natural cause of the financial crisis that has been afflicting our country for years...

Having no obstacle in front of them and sensing no opposition, the [Jewish] masters create artificial difficulties and crises, managing to find all sorts of means of extortion in order to satisfy their insatiable greed – all that despite people's misery, for misery is actually productive for those who are cruel enough to exploit others.

This Jewish coalition has gone so far as to monopolize drinks and public catering facilities... This appropriation resulted in ex-

cessively high public food prices in normal times and produced truly disastrous effects during the period of general food shortage. The working class is the one that suffers most from the greed of the monopolists, who sell scores of counterfeit goods and use all kinds of additives that are harmful to public health...

History provides clear evidence that Judaism practices exclusivism of the highest degree. Outwardly, out of necessity, the Jews might submit to the authorities of non-Jewish countries, but they would never agree to become an integral part of society. They just cannot erase the idea of a Jewish state from their mind, an idea whose strong and persistent manifestations can be seen in all their actions, over and over again. This is why the Jew of Spain, England, France or Poland is not a Spaniard, Englishman, Frenchman or Pole: he still remains a Jew, just like his ancestors were in biblical times.

No matter where they go, in great or small numbers, the Jews invariably plant the germs of destruction and dissolution with their presence alone, for they have a propensity to thrive on everyone else's ruin. The Jews feel no gratitude to the nations that took them in,[25] because they view those nations as usurpers. This is why they use all means to regain the rights of supremacy over the universe, rights that they believe were granted to them by their ancient covenant with God.

The Jews are in no position to invoke tolerance, for their religion is the most exclusive and oppressive one. Not only does Judaism accept nobody into its religious family, but it condemns to eternal hatred and persecution all those who do not belong to the Jewish race. It wages continuous war on the high moral ideas that permeate all the institutions of Christian states and underlie our civil society.[26]

Now, we are far from approving of even a minor injustice against the Jews, including those who are guilty of crimes, so we will just repeat what the popes used to say: "Expose the crime committed by a Jew, punish him according to the law, and take away what he has stolen. But do not take away what is lawfully his, do not punish him more harshly than his crime deserves, and most certainly, do not take his life if he has taken none."

There can be no doubt that it was Jewish usury and theft that has aroused the indignation of the Romanian people. Sure enough, this fact is vigorously denied by the Jewish press, but we know that the Talmud allows its followers to lie in order to preserve peace. In 1861, a Jewish author named Bédarride informed us that the Jews do not practice usury because they just cannot do it.[27] This is only natural given that the

Jews cannot deceive or steal either: they merely take back what rightfully belongs to them.

According to Hallez, a Paris lawyer, it would be a great mistake to believe that "the establishment of liberty and common law has led to any notable change or improvement in Jewish morals".[28]

He then adds: "After fourteen centuries, the Jews have preserved their superstitious practices and national customs almost intact, and these practices and customs, being products of the Oriental civilization, are totally incompatible with the principles of modern society."[29]

3

Lechery. – Revolution. – Universal domination by the press. – Freemasonry.

In 1848, the *Historisch-politische Blätter* newspaper laconically said: "The Jews are preachers of lechery and revolution."[30]

The lechery of distinguished Jews, if we may call them so, was brilliantly depicted by Anton Johann Gross-Hoffinger, who showed how rich Jewish bankers and stock market speculators of Vienna literally hunted beautiful ladies. He writes: "Their own women are too dear to them to be sacrificed for pleasure. Jewish men protect them and avoid seducing and dishonoring them. It is among the races destined to serve the Jews that they search for the most pure and chaste young women. And once all Jewish financial aristocrats have satiated themselves with the innocence of their victims, these are handed over to Christians and thrown into the abyss of the lowest prostitution. Now, the nobility still preserves vestiges of its old virtues: despite their vices, Christian noblemen are generous and show some feelings towards the victims of their pleasures. The Jew, however, shoves such women aside and tramples them underfoot."[31]

As to the poorer classes of Jewry, they excel at pimping and other related activities, as it can be seen in Hamburg, where highly obscene books, copperplates and the like are sold by the Jews. One of the most infamous of these rogues had to become a spy in exchange for the authorization the police had given him.[32]

We could already see that the lower Jewish classes indulge in prostitution thoroughly and everywhere. This fact fully justifies the verdict of history on the immorality of Judaism.

As far as revolution is concerned, everyone still remembers the high protection it received from Jews in 1848. Disraeli, a British statesman, said in this regard as follows: "[The] mighty revolution which is

at this moment [1844] preparing in Germany... is entirely developing under the auspices of Jews.”[33]

In 1861, Rougeyron expressed the same opinion, backing it as follows: “In Germany, there are terrifying revolutionary elements, such as Jewry... In that country, the Jews basically play the main part [in many areas] and are top-ranked revolutionaries. They [are] writers, philosophers, poets, orators, journalists and bankers, and they carry all the weight of ancient ignominy both on their heads and in their hearts. They will bring about a horrible day upon Germany, one probably followed by a horrible day for themselves.”[34][35]

Toussenel wrote along the same lines in 1847 [sic; 1845] in his famous book *Les Juifs, rois de l'époque*:

To make its wishes known to the members of the formal government, financial feudality has its own official newspaper, the *Journal des Débats*... The haute banque [major French banks] has made use of ministerial servility to insist that official news be published first in the *Journal des Débats* and only then in *Le Moniteur universel*. It is the articles of the *Journal*, penned by a few confidants of the R[othschild] house, that cause the ups and downs in the stock market. It has been made clear that the entire ministry [of finances] is compelled to pay the *Journal* a huge war indemnity.

Some prime ministers tried to get rid of this burdensome protectorate. De Villèle was one of them. However, he was overthrown by a coalition in which the *Journal* played a glorious role, and his successor Martignac had to pay the *Journal* the debt de Villèle had been due for three years.

Thiers, too, reportedly attempted a weak revolt against the *Journal's* despotism, but one single condemnatory article in this newspaper knocked the insolent fellow down. He asked for forgiveness and hastened to conclude peace with the *Journal's* cashier. The act of contrition was accepted.

Guizot and Duchâtel won the *Journal's* favor with their eagerness to execute any orders coming from the newspaper. “If it is possible, it has already been done. If it is impossible, it *will* be done.”

De Montalivet's devotion to the *Journal* exceeds the limits of servility. Strictly speaking, it was the *Journal* who was in charge at the Ministry of Interior when de Montalivet was the minister... The man crammed all public offices with scribblers from the *Journal* and got the public opinion accustomed to the idea that the *Journal* was a periodical of the royal court. Indeed, how could anyone have doubted it when the list of editors of this newspaper contained all the names of princes' mentors? [...]

Now, the *Journal des Débats* is the official periodical of the

haute banque rather than that of the royal court. It will only protect the court as long as the court remains obedient to the wishes of the powerful dealers from Rue Bergère and Rue Laffitte. Its devotion to the dynasty can only go this far. The *Journal* has buried a lot of dynasties during its existence, and it has long vowed not to attach itself to institutions that are so fragile. [...]

The *Journal des Débats* is a genuine power, one that is nearly officially recognized in Europe and which occasionally amuses itself by tickling the nostrils of the Russian emperor. And whenever an Austrian emperor or a British queen is crowned, an extraordinary delegate is sent by the *Journal* to assist at the ceremony.

I challenge you to enter a public library, in an amphitheater of the Collège de France or in that of Sorbonne University, without bumping heads – literally – with some editor of the *Journal*. The Court of Cassation, the Court of Accounts, the Council of State, the embassies, the Royal Council of Public Instruction – everything falls within the *Journal's* competence... Several years ago, de Broglie had an excellent idea to issue a decree stating that the consulates would be reserved to the [graduates] of a consular school. His decree has had no effect whatsoever. The true and only consular school is the *Journal des Débats*. It has its own consul general in Baghdad [a Jew], one in Alexandria, another in Jerusalem, and yet another in Genoa, not counting the one in Constantinople. [...]

Small wonder, then, that France is so worthily represented abroad! [*Sarcasm.*] Small wonder that France has already been relegated to a second-rank power in everyone's mind and is now sliding even further down the slope! [36]

This page of retrospective history has lost none of its relevance. Still, what a long path has been walked from Toussenel to Drumont!

One way or another, the action of this occult power, one so brilliantly described by Toussenel, allows us to better appreciate the following words of Disraeli: "The world is governed by very different personages to what is imagined by those who are not behind the scenes." [37] Or: "[The] mysterious Russian Diplomacy which so alarms Western Europe is organized and principally carried on by Jews." [38] Things are no different in Spain, Paris or elsewhere, according to the same author.

"A new messianic kingdom, a new Jerusalem must take the place of [the city of] popes and emperors," candidly says Crémieux [sic], president of the Alliance Israélite Universelle, an organization that spreads all over the world. [39][40] His words echo those of the Talmud, according to which all the nations, all the earth and everything that fills it belong to the Jews.

In 1866, a Jew named Bérend died in Brussels as a freethinker. As-truc, great rabbi of Belgium, presided over the funeral and gave this significant speech: "Bérend was able to become a freethinker while remaining a Jew... This is why both Freemasons and freethinkers had no trouble speaking by the side of Jews over the grave of a brother, a friend, a coreligionist that is equally mourned by everyone, be it Jews, Freemasons or freethinkers." [41]

This Jewish confession is rather telling, and it perfectly agrees with the long-known fact that Crémieux was both the great master of French Freemasonry and president of the Alliance Israélite.

But how come there is so much harmony between Jewry and the Masonic Lodge? We will answer with another question: How come the Jews of old sang praises to Arianism, [42] just like the Jews of today sing praises to Voltaire, Volney or Garibaldi? [43]

True Christianity and the Christian state are equally repulsive to the Jew. "Equality for all people, equal rights for everyone!" we hear over and over again. Nice words, but they imply the division and confiscation of the property. They imply that all the elements of resistance within the Church and the state will be overthrown by the upcoming revolution and the lodges. Once that is done, the loot will be divided among the winners and the marauders, while their victims will helplessly watch them. Crémieux's prophecy will then come true, and a new Jerusalem will be erected on the place where the thrones of popes and emperors once stood.

The poor lodge thinks that it will rule over the world when in fact it is a mere tool to bring about the Jewish reign.

Just look how one Freemason started lamenting about the Jewish might following the publication of Alban Stolz's book on Freemasonry. A look behind the scenes had enlightened and deeply moved the man. He wrote as follows: "The might acquired by the Jews with the help of Freemasonry has now reached its zenith. They are a terrible adversary both to the throne and the altar. Albeit barred from certain lodges, the Jews actually sit in all the lodges of the world. There are two Jewish lodges in London that pull the strings of all the revolutionary elements within Christian lodges. The Jews are in charge of every single lodge, and Christian lodges are nothing but blind puppets that are moved by Jewish hands, without even suspecting it for most of the time. A governing lodge entirely consisting of Jews also exists in Rome; it is one of the supreme tribunals of the revolution, and it rules over the other lodges by means of obscure heads. In Leipzig, a secret Jewish lodge is constantly at work during fairs, with no Christian having access to it. In Hamburg and Frankfurt, secret emissaries alone are admitted. When

will the powers that be finally realize that the sole purpose of the lodges is to sow revolution in the interests of Judaism? They had better pay heed to the words of [Edmund] Burke: 'Kings will be tyrants from policy, when subjects are rebels from principle.' "[44]

It is in the lodges' halls, points out Börne, that the nobles of all classes secretly learned principles that were treated as heresies in a secular society.[45]

A Jew named Mendizabal was the soul of the Portuguese revolution of 1820, being in charge of the uprisings in Lisbon and Porto. In the 1830s, he brought the revolution to Spain, thanks to his powerful Masonic influence over the Juntas. The Masonic revolution crowned him as Spanish prime minister.[46]

In a similar way, Crémieux, the great master of Freemasonry, was appointed as minister of justice by the 1848 French revolution, one crafted by the Lodge, as acknowledged by Lamartine and Garnier-Pagès. The same is true of the 1789 and 1830 revolutions.[47]

Even though the modern Jew, such as Crémieux and the like, no longer wants to hear about the Talmudic tales and absurdities, it is still quite obvious that the dream of Jewish world supremacy continues to be his obsession. To achieve this goal – in a struggle where all means are allowed by the Talmud – the modern Jew joins hands with the Talmudic one, and the two walk in unison.

If that was *not* the case, how would we explain that at the Jewish congress held on June 29, 1869 in Leipzig, one attended by the great rabbis of Turkey, Russia, Germany, England, France, Netherlands, Belgium, etc., and where the Orthodox and reformed Jews established two big groups, holding each other in balance – how would we explain that the common thesis of both groups was as follows: "The Synod acknowledges that the development and implementation of modern ideas is the safest guarantee for the present and future of Judaism and its children"?

Furthermore, one of the main periodicals of the Alliance Israélite informs us that revolution, with its ideas of equality and brotherhood, has been – and will be – a star of Israel, dissipating the darkness over the Jewish nation.[48]

Let us also recall that one of the leaders of the [First] International was Marx, a German Jew acting from London.[49]

All in all, revolution is a Jewish work par excellence, one that will finally allow the Jews to realize the dream of the ancient Talmudists and come to reign over the duped nations, which will destroy themselves with their own hands.

NOTES

[1] Philippe-Paul de Ségur, *Histoire de Napoléon et de la grande-armée pendant l'année 1812*, book XII, ch. III.

[2] Achille Laurent, *Relation historique des affaires de Syrie*, Paris, 1846, 2 vols. The second volume contains records pertaining to the double murder of Father Thomas and Ibrahim Amarah, the stories of Akhmed Arabach and a Turk named Hassan [attempted ritual murders], and many other valuable documents.

[3] Actually, there is nothing really original about this rabbinic stratagem. With great skill, the Jew has always replaced himself with Jesuits, making them scapegoats for his own faults. People are still speaking about Jesuitical subtlety, Jesuitical casuistry, etc., as if someone could match the Talmudists and rabbis when it comes to perverting morals, juggling with words or distorting texts. For the sake of justice and truth, one should say "Jewish" or "Judaic" rather than "Jesuitical". This book provides more than enough evidence of that, and we can recognize here the ancient slyness that made Joseph hide his cup in Benjamin's sack.

[4] JRBooksOnline: The account that follows has been somewhat edited by us based on Laurent's book.

[5] JRBooksOnline: To be accurate, the two brothers cut Father Thomas's throat.

[6] *Anklagen der Juden in Russland wegen Kindermords*, Leipzig, Wilhelm Engelmann, 18[46].

[7] JRBooksOnline: This is the famous Velizh case, the murder of a three-year-old boy named Fedor Emelyanov in 1823. The trial ended in 1835 with the acquittal of the Jewish defendants, even if there was enough evidence of their guilt. More of it can be found in our other publications, such as *A Memorandum on Ritual Murders* by V.I. Dal or *The Murder of Andrei Yushchinsky* by G.G. Zamyslovsky.

[8] Gougenot des Mousseaux, *Le Juif*, op. cit., p. 186.

[9] In particular, the case of Agnes Marcus, a young girl that had her blood drawn by two Jews, who then raped her and left her for dead. Three years later, she has still not obtained justice.

[10] Charles-Joseph Bail, *Des Juifs au XIX^e siècle*, Paris, 1816, p. 24.

[11] A. Cerfberr de Medelsheim, *Les juifs, leur histoire, leurs mœurs*, Paris, 1847, Préface.

[12] The author then mentions that the Jews commit few infanticides and explains this by their sense of family. We do not share this point of view as it is not in families that infanticides normally occur. A more plausible and convincing explanation can be found in the chapter "Woman".

[13] JRBooksOnline: The crime of stellionate consists in selling the same property to several persons or someone else's property as your own.

- [14] A. Cerfberr de Medelsheim, op. cit., Préface.
- [15] Ibid., p. 39.
- [16] Ibid., p. 38.
- [17] *Preussische Allgemeine Zeitung*, June 20, 1847.
- [18] Ibid., June 19, 1847.
- [19] Wilhelm Meinhold, *Sidonia von Bork, die Klosterhexe*, vol. 3, Leipzig, 1848, pp. 211–213.
- [20] JRBooksOnline: The chapter containing this text, “Extrablatt über die Emancipation der Juden” (inserted between chapters 13 and 14 of Book III), was left out in the English translation, published as: William Meinhold, *Sidonia the Sorceress*, Hammersmith, 1893.
- [21] *Le Monde illustré*, November 17, 1866.
- [22] JRBooksOnline: The book in question is: Ernest Desjardins, *Les Juifs de Moldavie*, Paris, 1867. What follows is a slightly abbreviated summary of the book as taken from the *L’Indépendance Hellénique* newspaper. We have somewhat edited this text based on the book itself.
- [23] There were 25,000 Jews in 1828, 55,000 in 1844, and 160,000 in 1854. In 1868, there were 400,000 Jews according to Crémieux or over 500,000 according to a report of the Romanian parliament (see below).
- [24] See also *Archives Israélites*, March 1, 1868, pp. 197–198.
- [25] The most striking example is that of popes. “Rome is our paradise,” used to say the Jews in the Middle Ages. Recently, however, *Archives Israélites* (June 1, 1867) has bashed a certain Jew named Mirès for having dared to say that Jewry ought to be grateful to the papacy.
- [26] See the full text of this draft law in *Archives Israélites*, May 1, 1868 (pp. 411–416) and May 15, 1868 (pp. 462–467).
- [27] Jassuda Bédarride, *Les Juifs en France, en Italie et en Espagne*, Paris, 1861, p. 430 [?].
- [28] Théophile Hallez, *Des Juifs en France*, Paris, 1845, p. 239.
- [29] Ibid., pp. 262–263.
- [30] *Historisch-politische Blätter*, 1848.
- [31] Anton Johann Gross-Hoffinger, *Die Schicksale der Frauen*, Leipzig, 1847, p. 40.
- [32] Johann Wilhelm Christern, *Entschleierte Geheimnisse der Prostitution in Hamburg*, Leipzig, 1847, p. 84.
- [33] Benjamin Disraeli, *Coningsby*, London, 1844, p. 232.
- [34] Guillaume Rougeyron, *De l’Antéchrist*, 1861, pp. 28–29.
- [35] JRBooksOnline: Rougeyron actually quotes Klemens von Metternich, a former Austrian chancellor, who reportedly said this to a French journalist (Louis Veuillot) in 1849, shortly after leaving office.
- [36] Alphonse Toussenel, *Les Juifs, rois de l’époque*, 1845, pp. 180–184, 189.
- [37] Benjamin Disraeli, op. cit., p. 234.
- [38] Ibid., p. 232.

[39] *Archives Israélites*, 1861 [sic; 1864], p. 651.

[40] JRBooksOnline: This was actually said by Joseph Salvador in his book *Jesus-Christ et sa doctrine*, vol. 1, 1864, p. XXI.

[41] *Archives Israélites*, 1866, pp. 927–928.

[42] JRBooksOnline: Arianism was an ancient religious movement that denied the divinity of Jesus Christ.

[43] *Archives Israélites*, 1867, p. 463.

[44] *Historisch-politische Blätter*, 1862.

[45] *Ibid.*, p. 430.

[46] *Ibid.*

[47] *Ibid.*

[48] *L'Univers Israélite*, September 5, 1867, p. 34.

[49] Hermann von Scharff-Scharffenstein, *Das geheime Treiben*, Stuttgart, 1871, p. 138.

CHAPTER 2

OPINIONS OF OUR CONTEMPORARIES

Kant, Fichte, Herder, Schopenhauer and Klüber on the Jews.

Itinerarium Philippi a Trinitate, a book published in 1649, tells that a Jew once travelled in the company of various Christians. All the travellers – including the Jew – proved to be good and faithful companions, helping each other in every possible way. Moved by the kindness of the Christians, the Jew told one of them as they parted: “It is true that we have been very kind to each other during this voyage, but you must know that the hatred that burned inside my heart was still great. In gratitude for your services, I would like to give you an advice: Never trust a Jew, no matter how friendly he may be with you.”[1]

Now, these words go back to the *dark and barbaric* Middle Ages, so let us listen to the wise men and philosophers of our time.

Kant says: “The Palestinians [i.e., Jews] living among us since their exile, or at least the great majority of them, have earned the not unfounded reputation of being cheaters, on account of the spirit of usury. Admittedly it seems strange to think of a *nation* of cheaters; but it is just as strange to think of a nation of nothing but merchants, the far greater majority of whom are bound by an ancient superstition recognized by the state they live in, seek no civil honor, but rather wish to make up for their loss through the advantage of outwitting the people under whom they find protection.”[2]

Kant’s remark on a nation consisting of “nothing but merchants” is perfectly echoed by the following words from the Talmud: “There is no profession worse than agriculture. If you have one hundred silver coins in trade, you can eat meat and drink wine every day, but if you use these one hundred coins in agriculture, you can only eat salt and vegetables.”[3]

Fichte writes as follows: “Through almost all countries of Europe, a powerful, hostile state is spreading that is permanently at war with all others and that pushes down very heavily on the citizens in some: it is Judaism. [I believe that] the latter becomes so horrible not [solely] because it forms a separate and tightly knotted state, but because *this state is founded upon the hatred of the entire human race*. [...]”

“This people sees everywhere the descendants of those who expel-

led them from their dearly beloved fatherland. It condemned itself, and is condemned [by others], to the retail trade [and usury] that numbs the body and kills the spirit toward any noble feeling. By the most binding [institution] that humanity knows, its religion, it [excludes itself] from our meals, our abundance of joy, and the sweet exchange of cheerfulness from heart to heart with us. It isolates itself from all of us with respect to its duties and rights and even with respect to the soul of the Lord. From such a people one should perhaps be able to expect something else than we currently see. The absolute king may not take my paternal hut, and my rights are protected against the almighty minister, *but the first Jew who feels like it can plunder me unpunished.*

"You witness all this and you cannot deny it. And you speak sugar-sweet words of tolerance, human rights, and civil rights, while you violate the first human rights in us. [...] Does the understandable thought not occur to you that the Jews – who without you are citizens of a state that is more fixed and powerful than all of yours – will trample your remaining citizens entirely under foot if you grant them the right of citizenship in your states as well? [...]"

"They must have human rights, even if they do not concede the same to us...[4] But in order to grant them rights of citizenship, I see no other means but to cut off their heads at night and to put other [heads] on them that have not even one Jewish idea in them. In order to protect ourselves against them, I see, in turn, no other means but to conquer their beloved land for them and to send them all there."[5]

Herder, for his part, writes: "In the arts, the Jews were always inexpert, though their country was situate between Egypt and Phoenicia, for even Solomon was obliged to employ foreign workmen in the construction of his temple. In like manner, though they possessed for some time the ports of the Red Sea and dwelt so near the shores of the Mediterranean, they never became a seafaring people, in a situation so favorable for engrossing the commerce of the world... They always chose to live among other nations, a feature of the national character which Moses powerfully exerted himself to eradicate. In short, they were a people spoiled in their education, because they never arrived at a maturity of political cultivation on their own soil, and consequently not to any true sentiment of liberty and honor.

"In science, their most eminent men have displayed more servile punctuality and order than productive freedom of mind, and their situation has almost ever denied them the virtues of a patriot. The people of God, whose country was once given them by Heaven itself, have been for thousands of years, nay, almost from their beginning, *parasitical plants on the trunks of other nations, a race of cunning brokers almost throughout the whole world*, who, in spite of all oppression, have never

been inspired with an ardent passion for their own honor, for a habitation, for a country of their own.”[6]

Herder further says: “The Jews we shall consider here only as parasitical plants, having fixed themselves on almost all the nations of Europe, and sucked more or less of their juices. After the downfall of ancient Rome there were yet comparatively few of them in Europe, but from the persecution of the Arabs they fled thither in great multitudes and divided themselves nationally. That the leprosy was brought into Europe by them is improbable, but *it was a still worse scab* that in all barbarous ages they were the base implements of usury as bankers, brokers, and servants of the empire...”[7]

To end with Herder: “The ministry where the Jew rules, the household where the Jew has the keys to the wardrobe or the till, the department or the police station where the Jews hold the reins, or the university where the Jews act as brokers and lenders for students are like the undrainable Pontine Marshes. For, to paraphrase the old saying [‘wherever there is a carcass, there the vultures will gather’], wherever there is rot and decay, insects and worms will swarm round.”[8]

Schopenhauer is no less harsh: “Ahasuerus, the wandering Jew, is nothing but the personification of the whole Jewish race. Since he sinned grievously against the Savior and World-Redeemer,[9] he shall never be delivered from earthly existence and its burden and moreover shall wander homeless in foreign lands.

“This is just the flight and fate of the small Jewish race which, strange to relate, was driven from its native land some two thousand years ago and has ever since existed and wandered homeless. On the other hand, many great and illustrious nations with which this pettifogging little nation cannot possibly be compared, such as the Assyrians, Medes, Persians, Phoenicians, Egyptians, Etruscans and others, have passed to eternal rest and entirely disappeared.

“And so even today... this John Lackland among the nations is to be found all over the globe, nowhere at home and nowhere a stranger. Moreover, it asserts its nationality with unprecedented obstinacy, and [...] it would also like to set foot somewhere and take root in order to arrive once more at a country, without which, of course, a people is like a ball floating in air.

“Till then, it lives parasitically on other nations and their soil; but yet it is inspired with the liveliest patriotism for its own nation. This is seen in the very firm way in which Jews stick together on the principle of each for all and all for each. [...]

“Accordingly, *it is an extremely superficial and false view to regard the Jews merely as a religious sect.* But if, in order to countenance

this error, Judaism is described by an expression borrowed from the Christian Church as 'Jewish confession', then this is a fundamentally false expression which is deliberately calculated to mislead and should not be allowed at all. On the contrary, 'Jewish nation' is the correct expression. [...]

"The fact that the well-known faults attaching to the Jewish national character, of which a surprising absence of all that is expressed by the word *verecundia* [modesty, shyness] is the most conspicuous, although this fault is far more useful in the world than is perhaps any positive quality; the fact, I say, that such faults are to be attributed mainly to the long and unjust oppression they have suffered, excuses them, it is true, but does not do away with them." [10]

As to this total absence of modesty or shyness, the Jews actually seem to realize it, for the Talmud says: "Three beings are [overly] impudent: Israel among the nations, the dog among the quadrupeds, and the rooster among the birds." [11]

We will end with the opinion of Klüber, the famous philosopher and professor of law: "The Jews are a politico-religious sect under a strong theocratic despotism of rabbis. With their manner of living together, with their trade-relations, their peculiar national education and their caste-like spirit of family they form a hereditary society of conspirators.

"The spirit of Judaism can normally be identified by its religious arrogance: the Jews believe they are a chosen people, raised by God above the Gentiles, who differ from the Jews both physically and morally, and who must be entirely exterminated.

"However, common sense tells – and experience confirms – that the spirit of caste, particularly if this caste is a politico-religious one, is incompatible with the wellbeing of the state and society. Now, when viewed from the political, religious and physical perspective, Judaism is still permeated with a spirit of caste that has no equal anywhere in Christian Europe. This circumstance has led to a continuous antagonism between Judaism and the state.

"To give the Jews, such as we see them today, exactly the same rights as those enjoyed by other citizens, [12] who are not nearly so opposed to the state [as the Jews are], that would be equivalent to turning this scourge – this antagonism that leads the state to ruin, or at best incessantly torments and weakens it – into an incurable plague. This is why we request a free, sincere and irrevocable abjuration, removal and reprobation of Talmudism." [13]

This wise and energetic conclusion of the eminent law expert prompts us to conclude as well.

NOTES

[1] *Itinerarium orientale R.P.F. Philippi a SSma Trinitate*, 1649, 6, 8.

[2] Immanuel Kant, *Anthropology from a Pragmatic Point of View*, vol. 4, Cambridge University Press, 2006, p. 100.

[3] Tr. Yevamot, f. 63, 1.

[4] This clearly follows from the Talmudic law.

[5] Johann Gottlieb Fichte, *Contribution to the Correction of the Public's Judgments on the French Revolution*, SUNY Press, 2021, pp. 102–103. Now, the Jews will never accept Fichte's solution, for the Promised Land is one flowing with milk and honey, that is, one where subjugated nations work for the Chosenites. From this point of view, the modern Jew is actually much more Talmudic than the ancient one: he has come so close to world domination that it would be madness on his part to move to his country and live at his own expense there.

[6] Johann Gottfried Herder, *Outlines of a Philosophy of the History of Man* (translation by T. Churchill), book 12, ch. 3 ("The Hebrews").

[7] Ibid., book 16, ch. 5 ("Foreign Nations in Europe").

[8] Johann Gottfried Herder, *Adrastea*, book 6, ch. 5 ("Bekehrung der Juden").

[9] Sure enough, the Jews reject this accusation by shifting the blame on Pontius Pilate. In the preface to his *Histoire de Jules César*, Napoleon the Third compared the nations that rejected their great men to the Jews who crucified their Messiah. He received an angry rebuke from Crémieux (see *L'Opinion Nationale*, February 27, 1865) and was made to understand that nobody – not even an emperor of the French – was allowed to offend the Jewish emperor.

[10] Arthur Schopenhauer, *Parerga and Paralipomena*, vol. 2, Oxford University Press, 2000, pp. 261–263.

[11] Tr. Beitzah, f. 25, 1.

[12] Today we would say: "To preserve the same rights."

[13] Johann Ludwig Klüber, *Übersicht der diplomatischen Verhandlungen des Wiener Congresses*, vol. 3, pp. 375ff. See also *Deutsches Bundesrecht* by the same author, 4th ed., par. 516, note 4.

CONCLUSION

SUMMARY AND SOLUTION

Even though the immoral and criminal precepts of rabbinism are nearly countless, we can easily group them by main features and briefly describe the quintessence of Talmudic teachings.

The following facts have been firmly established in this book:

- The Jew is not bound by the precepts of love or justice towards the neighbor when it comes to non-Jews, the goyim.

- Moreover, the Jew actually commits a sin if he displays love or justice towards the goyim, at any rate when he could have harmed them with impunity.

- The Jew can harm non-Jews, especially Christians, in every possible way, and he must do it whenever he has a chance. Furthermore, he can kill the goyim directly or bring about their death by other means. The principle to follow is this: “Their life is in your hands, and this is even more true of their property.”

- Every time a Jew has a dispute with a goy, the case must be decided in the Jew’s favor. If necessary, all kinds of intrigues can be used to achieve this outcome. However, this has to be done with caution so as not to get caught and thereby compromise Judaism.

- The goyim are nothing but cattle in the eyes of the Jews. Consequently, the Jew is not bound by the oath he takes in his dispute with a goy. If the Jew is compelled to take such an oath, he is entitled to repudiate it in his heart, either through mental reservation or by means of a phrase that distorts the meaning of the oath. But here, too, the Jew must avoid getting caught, and he is forbidden to perjure if the risk of being discovered is too high.

- The Jew is entitled to use a non-Jewish woman for pleasure. A married Jew does not commit adultery if he has intercourse with such a woman. The same is true if the Jew sleeps with a goy’s wife, for goyish marriage is nothing but mating between animals.

- The Jew is of one substance with God, just like a son is of one substance with his father. The Jew can yield to any temptations and satisfy all his passions, blaming it upon God, who created the “bad human nature”. Loyalty to Judaism excuses everything. The Jew can even convert to Christianity or Islam provided that he remains a faithful son of Israel in his heart.

– Any Jew (save for the Karaites, who live mainly in Crimea) can follow these principles whenever he wishes, out of religious duty.

– It is true that the modern Jew has abandoned some of the observances that are burdensome to him and have no bearing on us, for we care little if he rests on such and such day or abstains from such and such food or drink. Still, on all essential points, such as property and its acquisition, the attitude to non-Jews or world domination, the reformed Jew perfectly agrees with the Orthodox Talmudists, who constitute an overwhelming majority of the Jewish population anyway.

– The reformed Jews have never *condemned* Talmudism as being immoral and criminal, but have merely *advised against* it due to it being outdated, impractical and poorly suited for the accomplishment of Jewish destinies. This way, Talmudism, in all its harmful and dangerous aspects, continues to be as actual as before.

The conclusion to be drawn from the above is this:

It is both unfair and dangerous to grant equal rights to those who follow such a peculiar set of laws. Therefore, it will be fair, as well as indispensable and urgent, to revise the anti-national laws that opened the door of our society to such people.

They can enjoy human rights (even if, as Fichte pointed out, they do not concede those same rights to us), but they must be denied the rights of citizens.

They must be removed if not out of this world (after all, it was not us who brought them into it), then at least from our society, which belongs to us and for which they were not made.

It is high time they were banished from our civil and political life, and if this measure proves to be insufficient, they must also be banished from our country, one that we have received from our forefathers in order to pass it to our descendants rather than allow the pirates of mankind to take it by force or steal it by fraud, or let alone foolishly give it to them as a gift.

THE TALMUDIC JEW

EXPANDED EDITION

By AUGUST ROHLING

Translated and Edited by JR BOOKS ONLINE

August Rohling (1839–1931) was a German Catholic theologian, professor and author of critical studies of the Talmud, Judaism and Protestantism. His most famous work is *Der Talmudjude* ("The Talmudic Jew"), first published in 1871 in Münster. Immediately after its appearance, the Jews unleashed a smear campaign against the book and its author, even though all Rohling did was quote directly from the Talmud and various Jewish scholars.

We are happy to present the first English-language edition of this valuable historical document. We have created our translation from the French edition published in 1889 under the title *Le Juif selon le Talmud* (literally: "The Jew According to the Talmud"). Its translator and editor was A. Pontigny, who also wrote an introduction and a conclusion and who greatly expanded the text, mostly from Rohling's other publications. Edouard Drumont, a French journalist, author and politician, contributed the preface.

In his introduction, Pontigny says:

"For more than six centuries, numerous scholars from all of Europe have been trying to reveal the mysterious dogmas and laws of the Talmud to their contemporaries. But perhaps no other book has shed so much light on this important subject as *The Talmudic Jew*, published several years ago by August Rohling, professor at the University in Prague. The author's rare writing talent, his deep knowledge of the rabbinical language, literature and antiquities, his valiant frankness, and, last but not least, the general interest in this topic, more actual today than ever, ensured a sparkling success to this book, which quickly became a bestseller."

This book will be of great use to anyone interested in the history of Judaism.

Softcover, 113 pages, #1017, \$13 plus \$5 S&H in the U.S. Order from TBR BOOK CLUB, P.O. Box 550, White Plains, MD 20695. Call toll free at 1-877-773-9077 to charge, Mon.-Thu. 8-4 ET. Purchase online at: www.BarnesReview.com or www.JRBooksOnline.com.

On the cover: "An Old Man Studying," Maurycy Trebacz, 1896.

